


THE
SOCIAL INTERPRETATION
OF HISTORY

MAURICE WILLIAM

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

L I B R A R Y





THE SOCIAL INTERPRETATION
OF HISTORY

6

The
Social Interpretation
of History

A REFUTATION
OF THE MARXIAN ECONOMIC
INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

By
MAURICE WILLIAM
W

SOTERY PUBLISHING COMPANY
62 Vernon Avenue, Long Island City
NEW YORK

12/11/03


HX
86
.W65
1921

Copyright, 1921
Maurice William
Brooklyn, N. Y.

All rights reserved

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

Printed in the United States of America by
Harper & Brothers



CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE TO FIRST GENERAL EDITION	vii
PREFACE TO PRIVATE EDITION	xix
INTRODUCTION	xxiii
I. POLICY AND TACTICS	1
II. SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES	4
III. "STATE SOCIALISM"	8
IV. THE SOCIALISTS IN POLITICS	31
V. THE PRACTICAL PROGRAM AND SOCIALIST GROWTH	37
VI. ARE SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES SCIENTIFIC?	42
VII. MARXIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM	48
VIII. THE SOCIAL INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY	67
IX. "MARXISTS" AND THE MARXIAN METHOD	81
X. MARXIAN PRINCIPLES ANTISOCIAL	88
XI. WHOM DOES CAPITALISM EXPLOIT?	100
XII. EXPROPRIATING THE EXPROPRIATORS	109
XIII. "MARXISM" AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT	163
XIV. "MARXISM" AND THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT	176
XV. WAR AS A FORCE IN SOCIAL EVOLUTION	196
XVI. THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION	212
XVII. THE GERMAN REVOLUTION	226
XVIII. CONCLUSION	230

APPENDIX I

AN ANALYSIS OF HILLQUIT'S ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST SITUATION . . .	268
--	-----

CONTENTS

APPENDIX II

MANIFESTO AND PROGRAM OF THE LEFT WING SECTION SOCIALIST PARTY	290
---	-----

APPENDIX III

MANIFESTOS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND STATEMENTS BY LENINE, TROTSKY AND OTHERS	308
A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKINGMEN FROM THE SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLIC OF RUSSIA .	308
MESSAGE FROM NIKOLAI LENINE TO WORKERS OF GREAT BRITAIN	326
TROTSKY'S SPEECH TO THE PETROGRAD SOVIET .	332
FAIRMOS TWENTY-ONE POINTS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL	342
MOSCOW INTERNATIONAL ISSUES MANIFESTO .	349
MANIFESTO OF THE MOSCOW INTERNATIONAL .	358
THE NEW COMMUNIST MANIFESTO	368
TO THE WORKERS OF THE WORLD	379
THIRD INTERNATIONAL IN SESSION AT MOSCOW .	388
U. S. SOCIALIST REQUEST TO JOIN TAKEN UP IN MOSCOW	392

PREFACE TO FIRST GENERAL EDITION

THIS volume made its first appearance in July, 1920, as a limited private edition.

Copies were forwarded to prominent Socialists of all factions, as I hoped to benefit by the criticism of Socialists of every hue. Such criticism was invited in the following

AUTHOR'S NOTE:

The World War has removed Socialism from the realm of academic discussion, and advanced it to first place as the momentous problem of the day.

What promise does Socialism hold out to humanity? Has it come to destroy or to build? Does it mean progress and peace or does it mean chaos and civil war? Is it a menace to civilization or is it an inevitable stage in the development of civilization?

The following pages are devoted to a discussion of these fundamental questions.

Knowing of your deep interest in the subject, I take this means of bringing my views to your attention in the hope that I may obtain for them the benefit of your critical consideration.

The world is prostrate and bleeding from a thousand wounds. The times call for a consultation of all minds in that our common judgment may prove equal to the herculean task of restoring a tottering and delirious world to sanity and health.

At no time in history has an understanding of the laws controlling social processes been more imperatively needed than to-day. In knowledge rests the hope of the world.

As a student, you are charged with an inescapable mandate. "Light, give us light," is the agonized cry of a world plunged in darkness. If not through common counsel, how is this cry of distress to be effectively answered?

Your judgment of my contribution toward the answer will be gratefully received.

MAURICE WILLIAM.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

One year has now elapsed since the distribution of my book. With two notable exceptions not a single Socialist offered his criticism or came forward in defense of doctrinaire Marxism.

Socialists are never without a chip on their shoulders defying the world to meet their unanswerable (?) arguments, yet when a voice of doubt is raised from within their own ranks they find it more convenient to meet it with a conspiracy of silence.

This general edition affords me an opportunity to submit my case to the great unbiased student body which, like myself, is in search of the truth.

My conclusions, challenging the historic and scientific validity of Marxian Socialism, were formulated in 1919. That was a singularly inappropriate year to question theories which at least in one country had been translated into historic fact. Russia, in the throes of revolutionary fervor, stood out in triumphant vindication of Marxian principles. The spectacular success scored in Russia by uncompromising, revolutionary, Marxian Socialism was the signal for a spontaneous world-wide revolt against the parliamentary reformism of the Second International.

Socialist leaders whose whole reputation had been built upon a program of peaceful social reform were suddenly converted into uncompromising revolutionaries. What a mad scramble to escape from the sinking Second International ship! No one has a good word to say for the Second International and its program of political action and peaceful social reform. Now, they are all revolutionary Socialists. Could they have given more effective support to the charge that political democracy and social reform have no relation whatever to Marxian Revolutionary Socialism?

Marxian principles can be applied only through a class movement of *producers*, whereas democratic principles are the agency of a social movement of *consumers*. No wonder Mr. Lenin, world leader of Marxian Socialism, scorns democracy as a bourgeois conception! Marxian principles must wage relentless war upon democratic principles. Marxian Socialism is based upon the theory that class conflict is the propelling motive force in history.

The Social Interpretation of History is based upon the theory that man's effort to solve his problem of existence is the propelling motive force in history. This is primarily a consumer problem. Class conflict is an effect, not a cause. The abolition of classes and class conflict cannot insure the permanency of a social system. Do its productive forces register an advance in the direction toward a solution to the problem of existence? This is the final, historic test to which all social systems are submitted. No

social system can endure if it fails to meet this test. It will be superseded by a social system whose productive forces mark an advance in the direction towards a solution to the problem of existence. The fact that the new system may bring with it classes and the class struggle will not affect the change.

These conclusions form the basis for the social interpretation of history. They constitute the theoretical premise for the prediction I made two years ago that the "Socialism" of Russia, based upon the Marxian theory of the class struggle, is Utopian, must fail and will have to give way to the capitalist mode of production developed under a social system based upon political democracy. Has this prediction been vindicated? Let us see.

Socialists of all countries did not find it at all difficult to persuade themselves that the "Socialism" of Russia was a permanent institution. Lenin and Trotsky, flushed with victory, ordered Socialists everywhere to follow their example, or be branded as traitors to Marxian scientific Socialism. Russia claimed the right to dictate, for was it not the first to forever abolish Capitalism?

Even as late as May, 1921, Lenin repeated his boast that he had completely destroyed the bourgeois system. Said he: "The bourgeois class does not exist any more in Russia. We have completely destroyed the Russian bourgeoisie." But the very next month¹ the following startling announcement appeared: "*Free trade is inaugurated.* Communist

¹ *New York Call*, June 3, 1921. My Italics.

Party's conference approves scheme to encourage private business."

What can be the significance of this new and wholly unexpected policy? How is it to be interpreted? The real interpretation is furnished by no less an authority than Lenin himself, who says, "Freedom of commerce means a return to Capitalism."¹

So the dictatorship of the proletariat has dictated the abolition of Socialism and the restoration of Capitalism! The Bolsheviks have abolished classes in order that they might create classes! They have abolished the class struggle in order to give new life to the class struggle! The profit system and wage slavery have been abolished. Long live private profit and wage slavery!

Such are the practical achievements of the great "Socialist State." To insure their realization the Bolsheviks did not hesitate to apply the most ruthless form of terrorism. Thousands of their own comrades met cruel deaths for their opposition to this mad experiment. Civil war of unheard-of ferocity, chaos, destruction, industrial paralysis, all these were not too high a price to pay to attain what? Capitalism!

Morris Hillquit apparently failed to notice Lenin's capitulation to Capitalism. In a lecture delivered a week later, he said, "If anybody says Socialism is impossible, we can point to Russia."² Yes, we can

¹ *Provo*, March 10, 1921.

² *New York Call*.

point to Russia and find that Marxian Socialism is—impossible!

Marxian Socialists never learn from experience; they are too scientific for that. Notwithstanding the complete and tragic failure of their experiment in Russia, Lenin and Trotsky order Socialists of all nations to follow in their footsteps. Force a revolution through civil war and the dictatorship of the proletariat, is their ukase to Socialists everywhere.

That destruction caused by civil war falls with the greatest force upon the workers themselves is a matter of supreme indifference to these self-appointed leaders of the workers. Fortunately, the workers of Europe and America are little influenced by the thunderings of Lenin and his Third International. They do not care to see the frightfulness of Bolshevik Russia repeated in their countries. But while Lenin and Trotsky failed in their attempt to apply their dogmas to the governments of Europe and America, in one direction their work of destruction was an unqualified success. They have brought about the complete disruption of the international Socialist movement. They have smashed the unified national units into three, four and even five different factions and ordered war to the knife between them.

Having destroyed the Socialist movement, they are attempting to apply the same tactics to the international trade-union movement. They order Labor to destroy Labor. No group organized by Capital for the specific purpose of destroying the international Socialist and Labor movement could have

accomplished its task more effectively than have the Bolsheviki.

Yet Morris Hillquit tells us that true Socialists must support Lenin and Trotsky "for the good they have accomplished." Whether he had in mind their destruction of the Socialist and Labor movement, their terrorism and civil war, their industrial collapse and restoration of Capitalism, or all of these, as "the good they had accomplished," Hillquit failed to indicate.

The World War had subjected Capitalism to the severest test in its history. The principle of private profit was pretty well discredited. In many departments of economic life the profit principle was completely abolished. Capitalism found itself badly in need of a friend to help restore its lost prestige. The Bolsheviki proved themselves a most unexpected but none-the-less welcome friend. To-day finds them on their knees before world Capitalists begging them to save dying Russia.

Capitalists are fully alive to the significance of the situation and make the most of it. It is now their turn to take the upper hand and ask some pertinent and embarrassing questions. The Capitalist attitude toward Soviet Russia is voiced in an address delivered before the American Institute of Banking by Francis H. Sisson of the Guarantee Trust Company of New York. Referring to the bankruptcy of Communism, Mr. Sisson says:

And last, but not least, is the open, if unwilling acknowledgment, by Lenin, that Communism is bankrupt and must at last

give Capitalism unlimited freedom. Lenin and the long-suffering Russian people have finally learned, at fearful cost, that Capitalism, the corner-stone of modern civilization, cannot be destroyed without accomplishing the destruction of civilization itself. . . . I venture the suggestion that when history records the post-war period it will place more emphasis upon the surrender of Communism to the empirical logic of Capitalism in accelerating universal economic stabilization than upon many events that are contemporaneously accorded far more importance.¹

Lenin is trying hard to make himself and his panicky disciples believe that Russia is not in danger of abolishing Communism and restoring Capitalism. He assures his followers that only small capitalists are to be encouraged. But from little acorns big oak trees grow, and as a man who is always swearing by Marx, Lenin ought to know that from small capitalists big capitalists grow.

Nor is this all.

Capitalism must have political democracy, for that is the only medium in which it can properly function and grow. Small Capitalism therefore makes inevitable both big Capitalism and political democracy. All this will have been brought about through the dictatorship of the proletariat!

Marxian Socialism has been put to the test in Russia. It proved a complete failure. The collapse of Bolshevism means the collapse of Marxian Socialism. History proved Marxian principles to be both Utopian and antisocial. They were swept

¹ *New York Times*, June 17, 1921.

aside by the inexorable operations of Social Evolution.

The problems of consumers constitute the sole concern of Social Evolution. Its task is to solve the problem of existence. The "Socialism" of Russia is Utopian because it failed to register an advance in the direction towards a solution to the basic consumer problem: the problem of existence.

Underproduction of the needs of consumers has made for the abolition of every social system recorded in history. *Underproduction* of the needs of consumers is about to abolish the "Socialism" of Russia. Capitalism will succeed Marxian scientific Socialism because it is better qualified to provide the needs of consumers. Thus will the social system based upon the Utopian antisocial Marxian principles come to an end.

While the attention of Marxian Socialists has been concentrated upon the great achievements of "Socialism" in Russia, a historic change of tremendous social significance is shaping itself in Germany.

Marxian Socialists accuse German Socialists of having betrayed their principles. Germany might also have been a Socialist State if the social patriots had proved true to the principles of Karl Marx! But their betrayal made it impossible to establish Socialism, and Capitalism has again obtained the upper hand and is stronger than ever! Such is the reasoning of those who accept the conclusions of Karl Marx.

What are the historic facts? In no country in the

world is Capitalism compelled to fight harder for its life than in Germany! The pre-war Capitalism of Germany proved a phenomenal producer. But to-day Germany must produce as it has never produced before. Production based upon the capitalist principle—profit—is being subjected to the severest test in its history. *Underproduction* of the needs of consumers is threatening the existence of the Capitalist system in Germany.

In an effort to meet the requirements of the German people, the capitalists in control of the productive forces of the German nation are co-operating with their government in an effort to eliminate all waste and all elements that tend to retard production. These requirements call for the socialization of transportation, communication, distribution as well as of the coal mines. While all this tends to stimulate production to an unprecedented degree it will fail to meet the extraordinary requirements of the German people. The huge indemnity compels them to produce for the Allies as well as for themselves.

Those living to-day are destined to witness a remarkable historic phenomenon. In Russia, *underproduction* is holding out its historic threat to "Socialism" and paving the way to Capitalism, while at the same time in Germany *underproduction* is holding out its historic threat to Capitalism and paving the way to Socialism. Both changes are compelled by the interests of consumers.

Historically and therefore scientifically Germany,

not Russia, is destined to be the first Socialist State. It will be attained through the agency of the democratic State. For the democratic State is not "a bourgeois conception," but a historic development calculated to best serve the interests of the majority in their capacity as consumers.

The German Majority Socialists have betrayed the principles of Karl Marx, but have been true to the consumer interests of the German people. This is the sole explanation for their vitality. Their activities are based upon the hated social democratic reform program of the Second International. This program conforms to the laws of Social Evolution and therefore is scientific.

The masses of the world have turned from the Socialists in proportion as the Socialists have turned from the practical program of the Second International. If Socialists want to regain and retain the support of the masses they will have to abandon the Utopian antisocial principles of Karl Marx and base their appeal upon the practical reform program of the Second International.

Marxian "scientific" Socialists glory in the Third International because its practical program is based upon the theoretical principles of Karl Marx. *Yet this is precisely the reason the Third International is doomed to fail.*

The views advanced in this volume were developed two years ago. Two years are hardly a sufficient test for new social theories. But inasmuch as they are the only available test I ask the reader to com-

pare the views developed in these pages with the experiences of the past two years. Do recent tendencies refute or support my conclusions? I shall cheerfully abide by the verdict of the unbiased reader.

My thanks are due to Mr. D. H. Robbins for his assistance in rearranging some of the material. Mr. Robbins is in no way to be held responsible for the views or criticisms advanced in these pages. The responsibility is solely my own.

MAURICE WILLIAM.

Brooklyn, N. Y., August, 1921

PREFACE TO PRIVATE EDITION

In these days of disorganization and disintegration, a contribution dealing with the problems of International Socialism hardly calls for an apology.

The following study was undertaken in December, 1918, and completed in July, 1919. At the outset I little dreamed that this investigation would lead me to question the validity of Marxian conclusions. A disciple of Marxian Socialism for more than a quarter of a century, I have had unbounded faith in the claim that Marxian principles are based upon the science and laws of social evolution. To me it is now evident that this claim cannot stand the test of an original investigation.

Did Marx discover the laws of social evolution? Do his principles conform to these laws? Did he put Socialism upon a scientific basis? I can no longer answer these questions in the affirmative without violence to the facts of history. History seems to indicate that Marxian principles are neither scientific nor socialistic, but, on the contrary, are both Utopian and anti-social. These conclusions have been forced upon me by the lessons of history.

I am aware that the views I have developed in these pages are quite unorthodox. They constitute

an indictment of the leaders of International Socialism who believe they have been following in the footsteps of Marx. While Marx may have erred in his conclusions, he was none the less a scientist. He applied the scientific method. History alone furnished the basis for his conclusions. He may have misread the lessons of history, but he never looked elsewhere for his understanding of social processes. Present-day leaders of International Socialism, unlike Marx, refuse to study history, preferring to cling dogmatically to the conclusions formulated by Marx in 1848. Such is the extent of their "science." Our leaders could not have chosen a more effective method of bringing about the destruction of the International Socialist movement.

Although this study was completed almost a year ago, for obvious reasons I did not care to obtain publicity for my conclusions without first submitting them to authoritative criticism. But in the meanwhile many things have happened. The Socialist Party of America has been split up into warring factions. The Left groups are subjecting the Party to scathing criticism. Neither has the Third International been sparing in its criticism of the American Socialist Party. These criticisms have obtained wide publicity. I therefore feel that nothing that I might say could react against the Socialist Party with greater force than the criticisms that have already been leveled against it.

Nevertheless, I prefer to withhold my conclusions from the general public, pending their review by

authoritative critics. To this end, I have elected to publish a limited private edition, copies of which I propose to place in the hands of those whose training and activities would indicate their special fitness to pass upon the merit of my material. Their judgment will determine the final disposition of the data I have collected.

The material gathered in this little volume has been developed under conditions that proved most trying. Enjoying but little leisure, I could devote but an occasional hour to my task. That this volume is sadly lacking in literary merit is to me all too apparent. It is not, however, the form but the substance that I wish to submit for critical consideration.

Not a line of this work has been altered since it was finished about a year ago. I have made certain predictions. These shall be submitted to the test of Time.

This contribution is the effort of a humble member of the rank and file—a “Jimmie Higgins” in the Socialist Party. Twenty-five years of close affiliation with the Socialist movement is the only excuse I have to offer for my deep interest and saddened heart over the wreckage and ruin of our once apparently healthy movement.

I wish to do what I can to restore our Party not as a hollow monument to the dead past but as an effective social instrument for the living present.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

June, 1920.

INTRODUCTION

“The Socialist International is dead, long live the Capitalist International!”

Such is the slogan the enemies of Socialism joyously proclaim. To attempt to withhold this sad truth from the world and from ourselves would be more than folly; it would be criminal.

The World War has shattered the Socialist International. It has shattered the units comprising the International. It has engendered war between the units and between the factions within the units.

To all mankind the World War appears as the most colossal tragedy in history; to the Socialist it has brought a double tragedy, the unprecedented slaughter and the internal disruption of the Party to the creation and nurture of which he had so willingly devoted the best years of his life.

Where is the comradeship which but yesterday thrilled us with its warm and binding force? The devoted and scholarly comrade of yesterday is looked upon as the traitor and renegade of to-day. Everywhere we find the Socialists arrayed against each other. In the countries where the Party is small and weak, the strife between them manifests itself in theoretical discussions which fail to convince

either side, but rather lead to more intense bitterness. In other countries where the Socialists, if united, could be a compelling factor in advancing social progress, we find them split up into rival camps, waging war on one another, hopelessly impotent as a social force. And when the long-yearned-for day has at last arrived, the day that would see thrones shattered, revolutions joyously proclaimed, and the powers of government vested in the hands of Socialists, what picture greets our gaze? Harmonious and joyous comradeship, united by the binding force of victory and peace? Such was the picture which filled the minds and inspired the souls of the exalted martyrs who rotted in cells and shed their blood that this picture might find its counterpart in the world of man. Realities, alas, refuse to conform to mental images. Revolutionary Russia finds the Socialists not at peace, but at war. The red flag, the symbol of comradeship and brotherhood, has been converted into the symbol of chaos, strife, and the blood that gushes from the breast of Comrade in answer to the bayonet plunged by the hand of Comrade. In Germany, too, Comrades baptize a Socialist victory with the blood of Comrades. Each bayonet finds its mark not alone in the breast into which it is plunged, but pierces also the breast and heart of every devoted Comrade the world over, the noble men and women whom we attracted and inspired with our promise of comradeship, brotherhood and peace.

Five years ago was there a Socialist in the world

who could have believed that, when the test came, the International would collapse? Yet Socialists have looked upon themselves as the world's seers. Of all in society, the Socialists alone saw the possibility of a world war. They recognized in the present epoch of commodity production a constant menace to the peace of the world. Over four years of world carnage, millions upon millions of premature graves and untold millions of disfigured and mutilated furnish ghastly proof of the validity of the Socialist prediction.

The end of the World War has come at last. Never have the masses been in greater need of the teachings of a united Socialist movement. From all sides upturned faces look yearningly to us for guidance. Never was opportunity greater. Yet never were we so incapable of taking advantage of it. We preach co-operation, but among ourselves we are hopelessly divided.

In former days Socialists would smile at statements by non-Socialists to the effect that there seem to be fifty-seven different varieties of Socialism; but can we smile at that statement to-day? No longer have we one International, but two, and each charges the other with being a traitor to humanity and to "scientific Socialism."

Who, in the present chaos and upheaval, would undertake to define the aims and methods of Socialism? Does Socialism mean the dictatorship of the proletariat and civil war, or does it mean Social Democracy? Does it mean the destruction of the

State or does it mean legal methods through the democratic state machinery? Does it mean class rule or does it mean the abolition of class rule? The following is one of the articles adopted by the Congress of the Communist International held in March, 1919: "The revolutionary epoch demands that the proletariat should employ such fighting methods as will concentrate its entire energy, *viz.*: the method of mass action, and lead to *its logical consequence—the direct collision with the capitalist state machine in an open combat.*" Do our leaders wish us to accept this as the correct Socialist position?

Is it the aim of Socialism to emancipate the masses or does it aim to enslave the bourgeoisie? In the same manifesto of the Communist International we find that: "Only after the proletariat has achieved victory and has broken the resistance of the bourgeoisie *can it make use of its former opponents for the benefit of the new order* by placing them under its control and gradually associating them in the work of Communist reconstruction."

If this henceforth to be accepted as scientific Socialism?

What is the character of the Socialism of the Social Revolutionary and Social Democratic parties of Russia who stand in opposition to the Bolsheviks? These groups have made official request for the creation of an international commission consisting of representatives of all Socialist parties to visit Russia and after inquiries on the spot to give clear answers to the following questions:

(1) Are we right, yes or no, when we declare that the Bolshevik Government has degenerated into an instrument of reaction; and although it hides behind the words, "the will of the workmen and peasants," does not shrink from the most extreme measures of oppressions directed against these same workmen and peasants?

(2) Are we right when we declare that the Bolshevik Government has now no other aim than to preserve at all costs its own power, and that with this object it is ready to sacrifice all the conquests of the revolution and take refuge in a state of terrorism directed not against the bourgeoisie, but against the other Socialist parties and the mass of proletariat and peasants whom they represent, and that, finally, eager to justify itself in the eyes of the foreign conquerors it has not hesitated in connection with the Mirbach incident to lay at his feet the dead bodies of two hundred of its own Social Revolutionary countrymen?

(3) Are we right when we declare that Bolshevism has done nothing to apply Socialist principles and has only succeeded in destroying industry and bringing about universal unemployment and starvation?

(4) Are we right when we declare that the Bolshevik Government denies every possibility to open discussion or to struggle for what we consider to be Russia's only hope of salvation, namely, the summoning of the Constitutional Assembly and the re-establishing of popular means of local administration—in a word, the placing of all power in the hands of the people?

(5) Are the Bolsheviks right when they assert that all other Russian Socialist parties are seeking not to free the working classes from the despotic oppression of a small minority, but are in concert with the bourgeois and monarchist elements to bring about a counter revolution?

Has the requested commission been created? Has it visited Russia? Were its findings such as to justify the National Executive Committee of the

Socialist Party of the United States in making this declaration:

Economically and socially, as well as politically, the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic is a government of the workers, by the workers, and for the workers. We denounce as utterly incompatible with any principles of *democratic* or international decency any and all plans of invasion. We call upon *all true believers in democracy* in the United States to join with us in urging our government to recognize the Russian Soviet Republic. [My italics.]

Upon what does the National Executive Committee base its appeal to all true believers in democracy in behalf of Bolshevik Russia? Does the Socialist Party indorse the Bolshevik form of democracy for this country?

The Socialist movement has always been very boastful in its claims that it is a scientific movement and that all of its activities are based upon a clear understanding of social processes. What are we told to-day? We are now told that the Second International was not a Socialist International at all, but a traitor to "scientific" Socialism.

As to Socialist literature, on all sides we hear the demand raised that all the "scientific" Socialist literature written in the past forty years and upon which the appeal for the people's support was made should now be suppressed and new and genuinely "scientific" literature be published in its stead.

Nor is this all.

The practical program of the Second International, which has been used as the bait with which to attract

the support of the masses, is now to be discarded and a new and "scientific" program substituted in its place. The Socialist movement must atone, we are told, for all the activities of the Second International, for it is now clear that they were not based upon Marxian Scientific Socialism. And yet, after the discovery of this startling situation, it is still said that differences within the movement are but differences over policy and tactics!

How are we to know that the new Communist International which to-day is offered as the only "scientific" Socialist International will not a few years hence also be exposed as a traitor to scientific Socialism?

By what means are we to test the *new* literature of *scientific* Socialism, which it is demanded should now be written, to supplant the literature of the past forty years? How are we to know that the new "practical" program which is to replace the one that has stood for scientific Socialism for these many years is sufficiently scientific to stand the test of time?

These questions must be met and answered if the International Socialist movement is to endure. Leadership carries with it responsibilities as well as honors. Our leaders have something to answer for to the members of the rank and file. They have led the International Socialist movement and they have led it to destruction. We of the rank and file are beginning to suspect the trustworthiness of our leaders. They have been telling us that the Socialist

movement is a scientific movement, and now they tell us that all the activities of the past forty years were unscientific and must be undone. What faith can we place in their word that the new International, the new literature and the new program will this time be certain to be scientific?

Before we again follow our leaders we demand that they prove to us that they are fit to lead. Before they again pretend to lead in a scientific movement they must prove that they understand what determines the scientific character of a movement. What is a scientific movement? Did Marx say that a scientific movement is one that is based upon some wise man's conclusions? What did he say? Do our leaders use the methods of Marx by which to determine the scientific character of their activities? Our leaders have ignored Marx's method. It is only his conclusions that have interested them. Marx studied society, but so-called Marxists study formulæ.

This study of society has been undertaken in the spirit of Marx, utilizing his scientific method of research. If the conclusions arrived at differ from those of Marx, it is but a proof that in no science is it possible to carry research to a final conclusion. The fundamental thing in science is research and not conclusions.

I make no pretense that my conclusions are the last word upon the subject; I expect no one blindly to accept them. What I do ask is that all serious-minded Socialists recognize the imperative need for

an exhaustive study of our internal problems. A scientific movement must seek to determine causes, and not dismiss vital differences by a resort to abuse and personalities.

If enough of our Comrades give serious study to the nature of our problems, we shall soon find ourselves well on the way toward their solution.

THE SOCIAL INTERPRETATION
OF HISTORY

THE SOCIAL INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

CHAPTER I

POLICY AND TACTICS

DIFFERENCES within the Second International are as old as the International itself. This is far from an original discovery. Socialist forums have echoed the opposing views of the master minds the world over. These differences have been responsible for a very large proportion of Socialist literature. Yet the problems are still with us with little hope of solution.

There have been instances where the theoretical principles which form the basis for Socialist activity have been brought into question, usually by narrowing their scope through exceptions and limitations.¹ But the main ground for heated discussion has been policy and tactics, the policy and tactics of the Left² wing or revolutionary group always differing radically from that of the Right wing or so-called

¹ (Conspicuous among those who have undertaken this task is Edward Bernstein.)

² See Left Wing Manifesto, p. 290.

moderates. The moderate wing in all countries has always urged that special stress be laid upon reforms that were calculated to advance the immediate interests of the working class. The Left or extremist group holds fast to the policy of emphasizing the revolutionary character of the Socialist movement, leaving it to non-Socialist parties to capitalize a platform of reform. Thus the controversy over policy and tactics has narrowed down to the question of emphasis, and that is where it rests to-day. It is therefore necessary that we make a study of the theoretical basis for Socialist policy and tactics.

There are to be found in every country where the right of suffrage has been won, a number of political parties. Each party represents the economic interests of its creators. Each must go before the people with an appeal for support. Each states its position in a drawn-up platform.

Nearly all of the non-Socialist parties have this in common: their policy and tactics dictate their platforms. As the principal aim of a non-Socialist party is to obtain political victory, and as this is obtainable only through the support of a substantial proportion of the electorate, the policy and tactics therefore dictate a platform in which every faction of the electorate is catered to, and its particular interests furthered. Thus we find that the platform promises a reduction of taxes to property owners and an extension of public improvements to attract the general voter; an extension of foreign markets and a decrease in military expenditures, a high

tariff and a reduction in the cost of living, etc., etc.

It is evident, therefore, that in non-Socialist parties the policy and tactics dictate the platform. In striking contrast to this, with the Socialist parties the world over, it is the platform which dictates the policy and tactics.

Socialists, too, wish to attract the support of a large proportion of the electorate, but it is not this aim which dictates their platform. To Socialists, political office is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. They have chosen the political method of applying in a practical way the fundamental principles which form the basis of their philosophy. It is their principles which form the basis for their platform. Their policy and tactics, therefore, must conform to and their scope limited by their platform.

It therefore becomes evident that if there is controversy within the movement, if there is factionalism and disruption and if there is general instability, the cause must be sought not in differences over policy and tactics, but in the very principles themselves.

It becomes necessary that we set ourselves the task of re-examining our fundamental principles in the hope that it may lead to a discovery of the underlying cause of all our problems.

CHAPTER II

SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES

THE International Socialist movement bases its activities on the principles laid down by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* published in 1848.

Three theoretical propositions constitute the fundamental basis of the *Communist Manifesto*. They are: the materialistic conception of history, the class struggle and the theory of surplus value. The history theory shows that all social systems are but a reflex of their economic foundation. The class struggle has been an inseparable phenomenon of every social system, manifesting itself in different forms in different epochs. In present-day capitalist society the class struggle arises from the fact that capital extracts surplus value from the working class. This exploitation takes place at the point of production.

How can this exploitation be eliminated? Industrial concentration and the class struggle indicate the way. The capitalist system must be abolished and replaced by the co-operative commonwealth.

In this very brief outline we find the basis for all Socialist activities as is indicated by the following quotation:¹

¹ American Socialist Party Platform, 1912.

“The first assertion of Socialism is its firm and final conviction that the present social order has served its functions, outgrown its usefulness, is henceforth utterly incompetent to meet the needs of human society, has become the source of unspeakable misery and suffering to the whole working class and therefore must be abandoned. *Capitalism must be overthrown.* Any longer compromising, temporizing or reforming of capitalism is not only *useless*, it is *criminal.*” (My italics.)

This is the theoretical stand taken by Socialist parties the world over. It was initiated by Marx and Engels nearly three quarters of a century ago and has not been deviated from to this day. Capitalism endures only because the Socialist parties lack the necessary power to abolish it. So according to Hillquit,¹ *the chief aim of Socialist activity is therefore to develop the numerical strength and political maturity required for the ultimate conquest of the powers of government.*

This gives us one phase, the theoretical phase, of Socialist activities. But in the past forty years, another, a practical phase, has developed and grown to large proportions. The Socialist parties of the world became the champions of a *positive* program of industrial and social reforms and *State Socialism*. A long list of *immediate demands* planks became a regular feature of every Socialist party platform.

What is the relation between this practical program and the Marxian theoretical principles? Do the

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice.*

principles justify the program? It does not appear so. The American Socialist Party has taken the stand that reforming of capitalism is not only useless, but is criminal. Yet that very platform contains a long list of immediate demands! Apart from this glaring contradiction, their relation to the theoretical principles must be determined.

We have seen that the modern class struggle arises from the fact that surplus value is extracted at the point of production. Modern production is social in its nature. The ownership of the social tools is vested in the hands of one class—the capitalist class. The laborer must use these tools in order to live, for he has nothing but his labor power to sell. This labor power he sells to the tool-owning capitalist. The laborer obtains his pay in wages for so many hours of labor power. This represents only a portion of the values his labor created. The remainder—the surplus value—is appropriated by the tool-owning capitalist. For the laborer to increase his wages means a reduction in the amount of surplus value remaining to the capitalist; for the capitalist to increase his portion, means either reduced wages, lengthened hours, or improved machinery and intensified labor effort. Between the tool owners and the users there is an irrepressible conflict—the class struggle. The economic interests of capital and labor are diametrically opposed.

In what way does the Socialist practical program of reform and State Socialism affect the extraction of surplus value? Is the portion falling to the cap-

italist class threatened by this program? These are some of the fundamental questions which have been agitating the international Socialist movement for years and still remain unsettled. Let us, as an instance, observe the Socialist attitude toward *State Socialism*.

CHAPTER III

“STATE SOCIALISM”

THE significance of “State Socialism” from the Socialist standpoint has for years been a subject of heated discussion. Four years of world war has taken this subject out of the realm of academic discussion and advanced it to the first place as the momentous practical problem of the day.

The party members very naturally look to their leaders and party organs for a well-defined position upon this vexing problem. They ask: “Are we to see in State Socialism a promise or a menace? Does it mean intensified exploitation by the State or does it mean the undermining of the principle of private property? Should Socialists work for it, against it, or ignore it?”

How have the leaders met this plea for intelligent enlightenment?

Joshua Wanhope has until recently been the chief editorial writer on the *New York Call*, the official organ of the Socialist Party in the East. Wanhope has for a great many years been recognized as a brilliant Socialist editor and teacher. Thousands of Socialists read his writings and accept his conclusions.

Let us examine some of his writings with a view to discovering his position as to the role of the Socialists in promoting social reform and State Socialism. The following samples of his writings ought to prove illuminating.

Just a few days prior to the 1916 presidential election, Wanhope undertook to give Mr. Norman Hapgood¹ a primary lesson in Socialist economics, principles, policy and tactics. With full knowledge of the importance of the moment, Wanhope very carefully proceeded to explain in the simplest possible language—"what we have explained thousands of times":

We have what we call the Capitalist system. Under the Capitalist system one set of men own the tools of production. Another set uses them. We are trying to make this very simple for Mr. Hapgood.

The set of men that own the tools . . . value their ownership only because they are able to make a profit from it. Through ownership they are able to levy a tribute two ways—first on every man and woman who works in these industries, and second, on every person who uses the product of these industries. Out of the ownership they make profit, and though the owners may live thousands of miles from what they own, they get their profit just the same.

We hope Mr. Hapgood follows closely, for this is all essential to beginners. The profit that is made out of ownership of industry by private individuals or corporations, ranges from the trifling income of the small magnate to the millions that come to a Morgan or a Rockefeller. The amount of profit that is made by any man is not of moment. What counts is, that it is

¹ (Mr. Norman Hapgood asks our opinion—We oblige him.—New York *Call*, November 2, 1916).

10 THE SOCIAL INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

this system under which our entire system is conducted. This we call the profit system or the capitalist system. . . .

Upon the system of industry all else is built. Everything roots back into the economic system. . . .

Now, this industrial or economic system is either good or it is bad. It is either right or it is wrong. And we Socialists hold that any system under which one class may lay tribute upon another and collect that tribute at the point of starvation *is utterly indefensible, and must go.* *We are at war upon that system. We cannot compromise with it.* We cannot say this year it is good though last year it was bad, and it may be bad again next year. We are against it always and constantly. We do not and cannot switch our principles from one pocket to another to suit somebody's whim.

Political parties represent economic interests. . . .

Now, Mr. Hapgood, the Socialist party represents in politics that industrial group that works but does not own. Between the owning and the non-owning or dispossessed group there is a wide gulf. Only a great fundamental change can wipe out that gulf.

Because there is this gulf of ownership we have these two classes—owning and working. The owning class naturally lays tribute upon the working class and the working class has to submit, or as we sometimes say, it has to pay. It has no way out of paying at present, since it pays by the very process of working. And the working class must work to stay alive. . . . This conflict is here, and it is very real, we assure you, Mr. Hapgood. In politics it is as real as it is in the factory. It is a thing of life, a thing of soul to the workers. Their struggle for emancipation is with them inspired. When they understand that great struggle thoroughly they can no more desert their cause and their class than they could take out their souls for barter.

So then, Mr. Hapgood, our opinion is this: Any Socialist who really does vote for any candidate except a Socialist candidate, is not really a Socialist at all. If he has thought he was a Socialist, he has been deceiving himself. He may have been very

sincere about it all, but he has been mistaken. Things are not black and white at the same time. Two and two are always four. And the Capitalist system of industry is always here. There are certain things that are not changed by words. Sophistry does not wipe out realities.

Now to go further. It is not denied that Mr. Wilson is a candidate of a capitalist party. He is a Democrat. His campaign bills are for the most part paid by capitalists. The capitalist class supports the Democratic Party. If it did not, there would be no Democratic Party. Now, Mr. Poole has cited a few measures enacted by the Democratic Party which he places value upon. He likes certain laws and he thinks that if Wilson is elected again we shall have more of them.

Very frankly, we say that there are some laws that have been passed by the Democratic administration that have social value. *But we deny that we have these laws because of any Democratic conscience. Rather, we have them because of Democratic—or Capitalist—fear.*

The Socialist movement is a movement for the workers against the exploiters. It represents the protest of labor against what is while it also represents labor's aspirations for the future.

In the course of its growth, this movement compels the representatives of capitalism to give ground here and there; attack on any organization forces the other side to give way wherever the attack grows to a point where it menaces the safety or security of the organization under attack. *So it has been in the fight of the Socialists on the capitalist system. It has to give way in a good many places.*

We find an illustration of this in the history of Bismarck's efforts to demolish the Socialist movement of Germany some thirty-five years ago. Bismarck, Mr. Poole will remember, *adopted a policy of enacting reform legislation in order to check the rapidly growing Socialist movement.* He came out for old age pensions, workmen's compensation and several measures of that stamp. In fact, he went much further than Mr. Wilson has gone. *He was driven harder, you see.*

But the Socialists were not deceived. Mr. Poole, who is a Socialist Party member, doubtless knows how August Bebel and a few other Socialists in the Reichstag even went so far as to vote *against* Bismarck's reform measures when they first came up. They said, "These are but sops and we will have nothing to do with them." Later they changed their attitude and said, "We will take what we can get," and voted for the Bismarck concessions.

There was a test, Mr. Hapgood, that points the course of Socialists when they get a capitalist government on the run. They don't run to join the Government. They run to drive it further.

August Bebel would not vote for Wilson this year. He would do all he could to roll up a tremendous Socialist vote to drive Wilson harder.

The pressure of labor's protest has its effect constantly. Every ounce of pressure put against the capitalist system *forces that much yielding.* And every inch yielded *is an inch nearer the final goal for the workers.*

This pressure of labor has been strong during the last four years. It has been growing stronger each year. It has been growing for several decades. It would be strange, indeed, Mr. Hapgood, if these years of agitation and growth and pressure did not force from the capitalist system *some surrender*, here and there. And that is just what has happened and what will continue to happen. And we make this prediction and this promise. No matter what capitalist candidate may be elected President or what candidates may be elected to Congress, if the revolutionary protest of labor as expressed through the Socialist Party is strong enough, there will be more forced from the capitalist system during the next four years than has been dreamed of in the past four years.

We do not deny that we are making progress. We do not deny that we are getting legislation to-day that could not have been got twenty years ago or ten years ago, *but we do declare that what we are getting is the fruit of our own fighting, and is not given to us*

by charitable-minded Democrats who represent the system against which our whole great fight is waged. *If the capitalist system gives, it gives because it has to, because it must,* because it is subject to the laws of self-preservation as is any other institution or organization.

In this struggle between the classes you must get down to fundamentals, Mr. Hapgood. You must examine causes. That is where you have been weak. That is where Mr. Poole is weak. You are looking at clouds and you think that the clouds are moving themselves around, whereas it is the moving air that drives the clouds around.

So there you have our views, Mr. Hapgood. We are glad to give them, glad to have you ask for them. We shall be glad to keep on giving them as long as there are persons who are not familiar with them. We are glad also to give them for the benefit of Mr. Poole. Fortunately for the working class, there are not many who call themselves Socialists, who are thus by their deeds planning to deny their Socialism and their class. There are very few, Mr. Hapgood, in spite of the clever press work that has been done by the Democratic Party. That is a good measure of the soundness of the overwhelming bulk of Socialists. They know where they stand and why.

Perhaps you will not agree with what we have said. We hardly expect that you will. But we assure you that *what we have said is the truth.* And really, if you do not understand it, we shall not be deeply grieved. It is a doctrine for the workers. And they are going to show by their votes this year that they are coming to understand it in numbers that will startle the nation.

At the polls, Mr. Hapgood, we will express our faith. There we will pledge anew our loyalty to our class. [My italics.]

The reader will readily understand why the foregoing article is quoted at length. It is Wanhope at his best; a masterful presentation of the orthodox Socialist conception of the role of the Socialist in

stimulating social progress. The vast majority of Socialists give this doctrine their unqualified support, and find here the logic for their policy and tactics.

Now, the above was written in November, 1916. Wanhope has written much since then. Let us contrast some of his later writings with the above.

Bismarck's program of State Socialism, Wanhope told us at one time, was due to the fear of the growing menace of Socialism. It was the growth of the Socialist movement which compelled Bismarck to yield these concessions. The Socialists were responsible for these working class gains. They represented a distinct loss to the capitalist class and a corresponding gain to the workers.

But shortly afterward, he had the following to say of German State Socialism:

It is true that German efficiency is due to what may be called "State Socialism," but it is also true that the Socialists have not been and are not now the deliberate driving force in this direction. On the contrary, they have had nothing more to do with it as a party than to forecast it as a necessary part of the development of capitalism and explain why capitalist society must take that road; the original promoters and executors of this tendency have in practically every case been capitalists.¹ [My italics.]

Although we learn in November, 1916, that Socialists forced Bismarck to adopt a State Socialist program, Wanhope completely reverses himself in January, 1917, saying that the capitalists and not the Socialists have been the driving force in this

¹ New York *Call*, January 17, 1917.

direction. Therefore, the working class, Wanhope argues, is not interested in State Socialism because the capitalist class is the sole promoter and beneficiary of State Socialism.

A few months later Wanhope in an editorial, "Humbling the Haughty Coal Barons," says:

Government ownership of coal mines isn't Socialism, of course; it is nothing more than what is recognized in popular terms as "State Socialism." But while it is a very debatable point as to whether there is any "benefit for the working class" it certainly has the merit of *scaring the coal mine owners into promises, at any rate, of decent behavior*. *They are genuinely frightened by it*, not because of any certain and immediate reduction of their profits, but rather because with their finely developed property instinct they recognize it as a menace to the principle of their ownership, the entrance of the thin end of a wedge that threatens to split the entire property system asunder, and rather than that even the beginning of such a thing should occur, they are more than willing to forego immediate profits, if that is the penalty for checking its advance.

We sincerely wish we could induce large numbers of Socialist theoreticians to see the matter in this light and lay stress on the weight and importance of this particular feature. It would simplify matters and tend to eliminate thousands of long and weary theoretical disquisitions against "State Socialism" which, after all, are nothing more than repetitions of things that have been said ten thousand times before. *The instinctive and correct FEAR of the capitalists generally AGAINST this policy constitutes the very best that can be said for it.* *The fear that it "leads to Socialism" is a perception that the capitalist gets much more quickly than the average Socialist can perceive the same truth.*

Thus we see plainly enough that rather than have even the beginning of "State Socialism" in the coal industry its beneficiaries would, for the time being at any rate, practically forego all their profit to *avert this dreadful thing happening!*

It is well for Socialists to note these things and work with all their might on the fears of these exploiters, for most certainly the time is coming when we shall have to take up this constructive work and push it to the limit, with the advantage of knowing that it is in accord with the course of economic evolution and that even the capitalists and their government, much as they hate and fear it, will be forced by the inexorable logic of events to put it through just as were the British and other European capitalists. And there is a wide range of other matters such as food control, state ownership of railroads, steel and oil supply, etc., in the same general line. Perhaps when we get some part of our attention released from the opposition to conscription, which now almost wholly occupies it, we can devote part of our energy at least to the pushing of this particular line of effort. Sooner or later we will have to do it anyhow, and the undisguised fear of the capitalists as manifested by these coal mine owners is the very best warrant that we can have that it is well worth while.¹ [My italics.]

According to the above editorial, capitalists recognize State Socialism as a menace to the principle of their ownership. Despite the fact that Socialists also fear State Socialism, nevertheless a clarion call to action is sounded by Wanhope, to throw themselves into the fight for State Socialism . . . “and work with all their might on the fears of these exploiters, for most certainly the time is coming when we shall have to take up this constructive work and push it to the limit. . . .”

There, fellow Socialists, you have Wanhope’s word for it that notwithstanding what he may have written before, Socialists should fight for State Socialism because the capitalist class is opposed to it.

¹ *New York Call*, June 28, 1917.

But suppose you didn't want to work for State Socialism and still wished to be considered a "scientific Socialist," to whom could you turn for support of your scientific Socialist position? Why, to Wanhope, of course, for he tells us¹ that "State Socialism" or "State Capitalism," *is not a function of the working class. It is a capitalist class function instead*, the function of the Capitalist State. *The workers anywhere never did or ever will establish State Socialism.* (My italics.)

And there you are.

In order to indicate how consistently inconsistent Wanhope can be we shall quote him again:

In former experiments with single items of municipal ownership in American cities it became a custom with the politicians to hamper the work of the municipal-owned utility with the object of discrediting the policy in the eyes of the people and inculcating the "it won't work" conclusion. Many small experiments were thereby brought to naught and the utility reverted again to private ownership.

A. B. Garretson, of the Brotherhood of R. R. Trainmen, now makes the same charge concerning the railroads under federal control. The previous controllers, he insists, are trying to queer the experiment and declares that word has been passed down the line to pile up all possible overtime. . . .

Mr. Garretson further states that for the first time in history big engines are allowed to freeze and "go dead," that train despatchers are playing the role of train delayers and crews have been held on side tracks with the deliberate purpose of piling up overtime. He adds that under this insidious form of sabotage great transportation systems are suddenly breaking down through this deliberate program of delay and inefficiency,

¹ New York Call, February 7, 1918.

and in attempting to fix the responsibility he hints that it is to be sought in New York in four banks.

Here are charges that are certainly worth looking into. It is not as if this kind of thing had not happened before on a smaller scale, but the principle is the same. This, if true, is a case of sabotage on an immense scale and in the most deadly form by the capitalists and *exposed and fought against by the workers*. The people who are doing it, the power behind the four banks, if Mr. Garretson's suspicions are allowed, are all patriots of the deepest dye. But with them it is not "If Germany wins nothing else matters," but "*If the railroads are taken from us nothing else matters.*"

The damage that such scoundrels can do is a million times greater than that of all the alien enemies in the country combined. And as Garretson is an experienced railroad man and one not given to fabricating rumors, *there should not be a moment's delay in looking into it*, as it places the entire national existence in deadly peril.

It is not reassuring to contemplate millions of people in New York and other great cities freezing to death like the great engines on the tracks, because the transportation of fuel is deliberately held up to inculcate the idea that the Government cannot possibly run the roads.

We have no hope that the people of the great cities can be aroused from their semi-frozen torpid state of both body and mind to do anything much in the matter. The mass of the population of this city appears to be hopeless, caring nothing much whether there is coal for the Winter or ice for the Summer; people who are not used to looking ahead, as all people who live from hand to mouth naturally tend to be.¹ . . . [My italics.]

I suspect that Comrade Wanhope is responsible for both editorials. In the first, State Socialism is a capitalist class function and is not a function of the working class. In the second the capitalist class is

¹ *New York Call*, February 7, 1918,

resorting to sabotage on a national scale in order to prevent State Socialism, for the capitalists say that "if the railroads are taken from us, nothing else matters."

In the second editorial State Socialism "is exposed and fought against *by the workingmen*," at which Wanhope seems very happy. For "the damage that such scoundrels (capitalists) can do (in their effort to discourage State Socialism) is a million times greater than that of all the alien enemies in the country combined . . . as it places the entire national existence in deadly peril." Therefore, the second editorial applauds the workers and urges them on to do what the first editorial solemnly told them "is not a function of the working class."

Rather confusing, is it not? We think so, and we are quite sure the reader thinks so. But strangest of all, Wanhope thinks so too. For, we find the following editorial on "Confusion About State Socialism":

There seems to be a very large number of avowed Socialists to whom the actual progress of the world in the direction of Socialism appears to be a sealed book; many who appear utterly oblivious of the fact that "State Socialism," as it is called, is the gateway through which society must inexorably travel to democratic Socialism. For them the great Socialist scholars, thinkers and publicists have written in vain. And for them the enormous changes that the war has already made in capitalist property relations mean nothing, indicate nothing, except perhaps a more intensified and longer continued slavery for the proletariat. They are not even "wise after the event."

We print in to-day's issue such a communication, showing as it does *the complete confusion that exists in the minds of many Socialists concerning this matter*.

We ask our readers to note the extraordinary contradictions

that run through it from the very beginning. First we are told that all our readers agree with us as to the significance of nationalization of railroads to the fulfillment of Socialism, and this is immediately followed by the assertion that State Capitalism is our most powerful foe! That Government ownership of railroads is no more Socialistic than the growth of the trusts. It would no doubt surprise this correspondent to hear that practically all well-informed Socialists do regard the growth of trusts as distinctly Socialistic; that they are certain indications of Socialism in the future, not only Socialists, but many capitalists, have long perceived. That this outlook should still exist is *certainly a reflection on the manner in which Socialist economics have been taught.* It can hardly be contended that the pupils are congenitally ignorant, but for some reason—*probably a fault of the teaching*—the actual Socialist view of “State Socialism” has not been clearly conveyed to them. . . . “It may very possibly be that there is yet a preponderance of Utopian ingredients in our Socialist thinking, an assumption that everything that is done to further Socialism must be consciously and deliberately done by an enlightened working class and a complete ignoring of the infinitely greater fact of the evolutionary process, unconsciously initiated and carried through by the capitalist state itself, a process of which the ultimate ends and even the indications are hardly seen by capitalist statesmen. We have been perhaps so obsessed with the idea that we Socialists were ever, and always must be, the sole factor that we have never been able to actually comprehend the importance of the evolutionary process in capitalist relations, always judging the act by the immediate intentions and objects of those who inaugurate it. Therefore, because apparently the State control of railroads guaranteed profits to the previous owners, that is the entire implication of the matter. It is a clever capitalist trick of no benefit to the workers, either immediately or in the future. It is this mode of thinking that no doubt gives rise to the fatuous criterion so often indulged in by Socialist agitators, “If this thing is for the benefit of the working class, I am for it; if not, I’m against it.” *The ridiculous assumption being that*

everything that happens from now until the ultimate realization of Socialism must necessarily be for the benefit—that is the immediate benefit—of the working class.

That this point of view is false and foolish needs no argument. Between now and the establishment of Socialism it is almost certain that most of the things that happen will not be for the immediate benefit of the working class and especially those things—like state control of railroads—that are inaugurated by capitalist and not by working class interests. There is no primrose path to Socialism; on the contrary, it is altogether likely to be even a rockier road than that which we have already traveled, and there never was and never will be an intelligent Socialist who will contend that “State Socialism” is or was intended to be of any immediate benefit to the workers. But that does not in the least prevent it from being an indication of and a prelude to genuine democratic collectivism. . . . [My italics.]¹

Thus does Wanhope voice his indictment of the ignorance so general among Socialists. He realizes apparently the paralyzing effect this ignorance has had on the practical achievements of the Socialist Party in this country. The situation is serious and gives him genuine concern. Now, who is responsible for this ignorance? Wanhope suggests that it is a fault of the teaching—a reflection on the manner in which Socialist economics have been taught. And Wanhope ought to know. He has been teaching Socialist economics for a great many years. He voices the views and teachings of the vast majority of the Socialist leaders and teachers. If, as he rightly says, there seems to be a very large number of avowed Socialists to whom the actual progress of the world in the direction of Socialism appears to be a sealed

¹ *New York Call*, January 2, 1918.

book, this glaring ignorance is not congenital, but a striking reflection of the scientific Socialist economics that have been drummed into them. As Wanhope himself admits, "a preponderance of Utopian ingredients in our Socialist thinking" is the logical result of a preponderance of Utopian teaching, despite that scientific label.

The one important lesson Wanhope seeks to send home to Hapgood is that everything that is done to further Socialism must be consciously and deliberately done by an enlightened working class. This fundamental position he completely repudiates and characterizes as Utopian in his "Confusion About State Socialism." This editorial goes much further. It turns upside down nearly every argument advanced as a lesson to Hapgood.

Nowhere, to our knowledge, has any other Socialist leader uttered a criticism of Wanhope's scientific lesson to Hapgood. He encountered criticism only when, in his series of contradictions, he for the moment repudiated that lesson. That is the point of which we must not lose sight, proving as it does that the Hapgood lesson was based on the accepted principles, policy and tactics of the American Socialist Party.

Our original question: Do social reforms and State Socialism represent a loss to the capitalist class and a gain for the exploited, still remains unanswered. Wanhope's series of explanations need to be explained. We must, therefore, look elsewhere for the answer to our query.

Hillquit offers an answer which has at least the merit of being definite. He tells us: "As the working class movement grows in strength, intelligence and determination, the ruling classes are forced to make concessions to it, either by way of granting or forestalling its demands. This is the secret of the recent reaction against the sacred laissez-faire principle of modern law, and the source of all 'social legislation' of the last few years."¹ Hillquit therefore agrees with the stand taken by Wanhope in his reply to Hapgood that reforms represent a loss to the capitalist class and a gain for the workers. These concessions are forced from the ruling class by the growth, intelligence and determination of the working class. If this be the *secret* of the recent reaction against the laissez-faire principle, where are we to look for the *secret* which will explain the reforms to which our attention is called by Karl Marx? Marx tells us of "the physical and moral regeneration" of the textile workers of Lancashire through the factory law of 1847, which "struck the feeblest eye."

As a Marxian scholar, Karl Kautsky ranks at least as the equal of Wanhope or Hillquit. Does he agree with their interpretation as to the significance of a reform measure? Does he believe that social reforms represent a loss to the ruling class and are granted only as a means of forestalling greater demands? It does not appear so. On the contrary, he believes that "a social reform can very well be in accord with the interest of the ruling class. It

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, Hillquit.

may for the moment leave their social domination untouched, or under certain circumstances can *even strengthen it.*"¹ (My italics.)

As the significance of social reform seems to be enshrouded in mystery and has aroused considerable difference of opinion, it may prove of benefit to briefly review some of the more important reforms enacted within the past fifty years and see if we cannot get at their true explanation.

To give a history of each act lies outside of the scope of this study. A general classification and the history of a few of the most important will amply serve our immediate purpose.

The list includes regulation of child labor, regulation of the labor of women, reduction of the hours of labor, protection against dangerous machinery, liability of employers for injury to their employees, workmen's health insurance, public health service, municipal baths, municipal markets, the free school system, free hospitals, sanatoria, etc., etc.

The economic, or State Socialist program, consists of national ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, mines, municipal railways, gas, water and electric service, housing, regulation of food prices, distribution of food, etc.

This is not offered as a complete list, neither is it claimed that all of these have been adopted in every country.

In taking as an instance the history of the public school system we learn that "Nearly the whole

¹ *Social Revolution*, p. 10.

industry of education has, within a century, passed from being, for the most part, a profit-making venture of the individual capitalist schoolmasters, into a service almost entirely conducted not for profit, but for use. . . . The development of the enterprise as a Government service has, during the past thirty years, alike in initiative and inventiveness, in diversity and adaptiveness to individual needs, surpassed all past experience and possible expectation."¹

When the suggestion was first made that society assume the cost of and responsibility for the education of the children of the masses, it aroused the bitterest opposition from the capitalist class. It was class legislation and paternalism, said they. Removing the rightful responsibility from the parents would tend to make them shiftless, lazy and lead to pauperization; and the State had no right to use the taxpayers' funds for the encouragement of irresponsibility, etc., etc.

Time brought with it a radical change of attitude on the part of the capitalist class. Experience proved that the taxpayers gained nothing by opposing the use of their funds for free public education: Coping with the natural consequences of ignorance called for expenditures even greater than the estimated cost of free public education. Ignorance brought with it a train of evils such as crime, vice, disease, vagrancy, etc., and capitalist society, for its own protection, was compelled to assume the burden of providing

¹ Fabian Research Department of England, quoted by Harry Laidler in *Public Ownership Throughout the World*.

various institutions for the proper handling of these problems. Not only was there no saving for the taxpayer, but industry, too, was compelled to pay the penalty of ignorance. As ignorant children grew into manhood, they proved useless as workers, except at the most unskilled kind of labor.

These practical experiences with ignorance accomplished more with the capitalist class than did years of agitation based on ethical grounds.

Education has been socialized in *response to the needs of the capitalist system.*

Next to education, no field reflects public concern to a greater degree than does Public Health. Every city in the United States has its Health Board, co-ordinating with State Health Boards and Federal Health Service.

Quarantine against contagious diseases, control of sanitation, sanitary inspection of food supply, inspection of schools, medical examination of school children, which led to the introduction of school clinics, school nurses, open-air schools and, in some cases, even school lunches. All these are outstanding examples of social interest in public health.

Scientific research upon a national and international scale forms a part of the public health activities of every modern nation. The public is protected against patent medicines and food preservatives detrimental to health.

Educational activities, ever broadening in their scope, aim to bring enlightenment on all phases of health protection. Infant care, infant feeding, child

hygiene, all aim at a high standard of health and prevention of disease.

What is the explanation for this degree of social interest in public health? The outbreak of epidemics usually gave the impetus to the movement for the creation of public health institutions. Epidemics are no respecters of classes. While they may have their inception in the slums, the limit of their operations is not easily controlled, and the capitalist class could not count upon immunity without protecting society as a whole. But that was not the sole consideration. As in the case of education, the health of the masses became a capitalist concern, for only a healthy working class can render the efficient service demanded by modern industry.

Capitalist society, therefore, was compelled to undertake the socialization of public health *in response to the needs of the capitalist class.*

Were we to trace the history of any other of the long list of reforms enacted in the past fifty years, we would invariably find that the same motive prompted its enactment. Whatever may be the nature of the reforms, whether social, industrial or economic, they were adopted by capitalist governments not through fear of an aroused working class, but because *they were in line with the interests of capitalist society.*

A reform can be considered in the nature of a concession only when it can be shown that it threatens exploitation at the point of production. Have the reforms thus far enacted brought about an appre-

ciable reduction in the rate of surplus value falling to the share of the owners of the means of production? No, they have not. Quite the contrary, a promise of an increase in profits constituted one of the principal arguments in the agitation for these reforms. Experience has amply justified this line of argument. Instead of reducing the rate of exploitation, social and industrial reforms have actually brought about a tremendous *increase in the rate of surplus value*. The experience of German capitalism is a striking proof of this assertion. No nation has as yet matched Germany's comprehensive program of social and industrial reform. Yet nowhere has the rate of exploitation been greater than in Germany. The fabulous profits realized by the German industrial barons excited both envy and fear in the hearts of the industrial capitalists of other nations. The remarkable increase in efficiency shown by the German proletariat following the institution of social and industrial reforms put the German industrial capitalists in a position to undersell the capitalists of other nations and thus capture the market. The wealth amassed prior to the war by the German capitalist class bears eloquent testimony to the efficacy of reforms as a means of multiplying production and increasing the rate of surplus value.

It was not to be expected, however, that the industrial capitalists of other nations would stand idly by and see their markets taken from them by the German capitalists. They must meet this competition or go under. And how did they undertake to

meet German competition? Why, by adopting Germany's own weapons—industrial and social reforms. The proletariat must be made more efficient, *i.e.*, the rate of surplus value must be increased. Increased production holds out the only hope of meeting German competition. This is the *secret* of the ambitious program of industrial and social reform that constitutes so conspicuous a part of the recent history of the English nation.

The same motive lies behind the industrial and social reform programs in the United States and every other industrially developed country. Increased efficiency multiplies production and therefore increases the rate of exploitation, and this, of course, is the end and aim of the capitalist class of every country.

In examining the practical programs of the Socialist parties of the world, what do we find? We find a series of demands identical with those championed by capitalist and autocratic governments, as well as by the most far-sighted capitalists!

What possible relation can these reform planks have to the Marxian principles which form the theoretical basis of International Socialism? Marxian principles aim to serve the welfare of the producer by reducing and abolishing exploitation, while the reforms that make up the practical program of the Socialist parties have, wherever adopted, served the welfare of the *exploiters* by invariably *increasing* the rate of exploitation!

Why do Socialists support a program which serves

the interests of the exploiters? Certainly not on scientific grounds. They cannot point to Marxian principles in justification of their action. Why, then, did the Socialists, in their practical program, repudiate Marxian principles? Let us see if we cannot discover the underlying cause for this phenomenon.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIALISTS IN POLITICS

MARX and Engels did not expect that Socialists should organize themselves into separate political parties. The Socialists were expected to support the working class in its battles with the exploiters.

With the extension of suffrage to the masses the question of independent political action became a vital issue that gave rise to heated debates and bitter controversies among the leaders of the early Socialist movement.

The uncompromising Marxians opposed Socialist participation in parliamentary elections. They could not see in what way such participation could possibly benefit the working class. It would have a most baneful effect upon the revolutionary character of the Socialist movement, said these leaders. It would lower the morale of the revolutionary proletariat. It would have a tendency to weaken revolutionary opposition to capitalist governments and the capitalist class and divert attention from the true purpose of Socialist activity—participation in the economic struggle and organization and education of the masses. When the majority of the masses have been won over to Socialism, argued the leaders,

times will be ripe for the social revolution and not for parliamentary elections.

In opposition to this uncompromising stand, it was argued that electoral campaigns offer unusual opportunities for Socialist propaganda among the masses. An elected Socialist representative would be in a most advantageous position to bring the Socialist principles to the attention of the entire nation. As it is the aim of Socialism to transform the existing state into the Socialist State, the experience attained through parliamentary participation would prove of invaluable benefit to the Socialist cause.

As years rolled by and the Socialists increased their numbers, the rank and file became more and more insistent that Socialists enter the field of practical politics. To confine their activities to the yearly repetition of the statements contained in the *Communist Manifesto*, that the capitalist system has outworn its usefulness and must be abolished, was plausible for a few years. But as the capitalist system refused to be abolished, the Socialists under penalty of losing their hold on the masses were compelled to enter the domain of practical politics.

“These, then,” says Hillquit,¹ “were the doubts and questions, the pros and cons, which met the Socialists at the threshold of their political career, and while the leaders were discussing the *theoretical* aspects of the problem, the masses, as usual in practical problems, solved it and, as usual, solved it

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, p. 174 (italics mine).

right. The Socialists went into politics *yielding to the instincts of the masses* rather than following the reasoned policies of their leaders." A rather startling admission of the utter lack of a scientific basis for the most momentous step undertaken by a movement that claims to be based on science!

Once forced into politics, the Socialists were compelled to take an active part in electoral campaigns. Their first successes were the election of a number of representatives to the North German Diet. There now arose a new controversy among the leaders. What should be the character of the activities of our representatives, became the burning question.

"My personal opinion," says Wilhelm Liebknecht, "was that our elected representatives should enter Parliament with a protest and withdraw immediately without, however, surrendering their credentials. With this opinion, I remained in the minority; it was decided that the representatives of democracy could utilize every opportunity they might deem appropriate in order to emphasize in the 'Diet' their attitude of *negation and protest*, but that *they should keep aloof from all practical parliamentary proceedings.*"¹

In these words does the great pioneer and leader inform us that, though the party had entered politics and elected representatives, the representatives were expected to remain true to the principles upon which the party was based and maintain a position of negation and protest and not to participate in

¹*Socialism in Theory and Practice*, Hillquit, pp. 181-2 (my italics).

practical proceedings. The elected officials represented a revolutionary party and not a party of reform; therefore their sole function was one of negation and protest.

“These negative tactics,” says Hillquit, “were steadfastly adhered to during the *first two sessions* of the North German Diet, but already the next session witnessed a *spontaneous departure from the rigid rule*, when several Socialist deputies took the floor in the first parliamentary discussion on the subject of governmental labor regulation. And the Socialist tactics of parliamentary abstinence have since *gradually but definitely given way* to the policy of watchful and energetic parliamentary activity.”¹ In other words, the Socialist representatives remained true to their Socialist principles for two sessions only, repudiating them thereafter and actively participating in the framing of practical reforms.

Such is the history of Socialist participation in practical politics and such is the genesis of the Socialist practical program of reform. Not only has this program no relation whatever to Marxian principles, but constitutes a complete renunciation of those principles.

The Socialist parties of the world accept Marxian principles in theory, but repudiate them in practice.

In this fundamental contradiction was laid the foundation for all Party strife. No sooner did the Socialists enter politics when differences arose. With the adoption of a practical program of reform

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, p. 182 (my italics).

these differences widened into chasms, irrevocably separating the membership of the parties into two main camps: (1) the consistent Marxians who believe in a practical program based upon Marxian principles, which could only mean revolutionary agitation, education, organization and the economic conflict; and (2) the opposing camp, while adhering to Marxian principles in theory, adopted a *positive* program which could find no justification in Marxian principles, but which, in fact, constituted a repudiation of his principles.

To speak of these differences as differences of opinion over policy and tactics is in itself a betrayal of the inability on the part of either camp to understand the true significance of the practical program which one side defends and the other opposes. Can it be said that the difference between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks is but a difference over policy and tactics? Is it a difference over policy and tactics that separates the Spartacists from the Majority Socialists? No, the cause lies much deeper. The Bolsheviks and the Spartacists know that the practical program heretofore adopted by Socialists constitutes a repudiation of Marxian principles and for that reason the supporters of that program are to-day looked upon as traitors to Marxian, revolutionary, scientific Socialism.

This breach will never be overcome so long as Socialists fail to recognize that the differences between them is one of principles and not merely over policy and tactics. When this fact is fully recognized, it

will then become the duty of either side to scientifically convince the other wherein its principles are wrong. With this scientifically established, we will attain the desideratum for which we all so fervently pray—a united Socialist movement, comradely marching shoulder to shoulder toward the common goal; a happy, peaceful, world-wide brotherhood.

CHAPTER V

THE PRACTICAL PROGRAM AND SOCIALIST GROWTH

THE supporters of the practical program never made an attempt to defend their position on theoretical grounds for the very good and sufficient reason that it could not be done. To defend the practical program on the ground of Marxian theory was to invite disaster; hence, no one has been so rash as to make the attempt.

Nevertheless, the program was defended and successfully too, not however on theoretical but intensely practical grounds. The principal defense offered was the marvelous growth in membership and vote consequent upon the adoption of the practical program. When it came to a discussion of the lapse from theory represented by the practical program, the revolutionary Marxians were in a position to make things mighty uncomfortable for the so-called opportunists or Right wingers. But when it came to a consideration of the effect the practical program had on the growth of the parties, ah! there is where the *opportunists* had their opportunity to hit back without fear of a comeback. And how they did smite! And how uncomfortable they made things for the uncompromising Marxians. Success

is always an unanswerable argument. Hillquit has so well summarized the marvelous benefits that accrued to the Socialist movement from its participation in practical politics that we cannot do better than quote him in full on this point:

“Whatever might have been the significance of Socialist politics as a factor in securing immediate social reforms,” says Hillquit, “it certainly has been of transcendent importance in the creation of the powerful organizations of Socialism. *It was the practical political battles of Socialism*, the concrete attacks on the enemy, the definite issues and war cries, the common victories and defeats that attracted multitudes of European workingmen, and it is these that are beginning to attract the mass of American workingmen to the banner of Socialism. If the number of Socialist voters of the world has grown from about 30,000 in 1867 to almost 10,000,000 in 1908; if the Socialists have become a recognized factor in the public life of twenty-five modern nations, having representation in the parliaments and administrative organs in sixteen of them; if the Socialists have elaborated a clear, detailed and sober program of social transformation, and developed in their ranks thousands of thinkers, orators, statesmen, organizers and leaders, *the practical politics of the modern Socialist parties is largely responsible for these splendid results*. Without the unifying and propelling force of political activity, *the Socialist movement to-day might not have advanced much beyond the stage of purely literary significance of the early Socialist schools or beyond that of a number of incoherent sects.*”¹

Thus does Hillquit, in a spirit of true pride, summarize the remarkable results that accrued to the Socialist parties consequent upon their empiric decision to participate in practical politics. Hillquit’s closing statement is extremely interesting and sig-

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, pp. 203-4 (my italics).

nificant. If the Socialists had not entered practical politics "they would not have advanced much beyond the stage of a number of incoherent sects." The success, therefore, of the scientific Socialist movement was not due to its scientific principles, but to an empirical, practical program! *Scientific* Socialists could succeed only as they repudiated *scientific* Socialism! What a "scientific" situation!

Hillquit is unquestionably right. In every country there is to be found either more than one Socialist Party or one, two and even three wings to the same party. Which constitutes the "incoherent sect"? Invariably it is the one most determined on consistent adherence to the uncompromising revolutionary Marxian principles.

In this country we have the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Party. The former is consistently Marxian and is an "incoherent sect" in consequence. The Socialist Party, on the other hand, runs its campaigns on some such issue as cheaper milk¹ and creates a furore! An investigation of the situation in any other country will disclose the same phenomenon.

What is the explanation for this extraordinary situation? Marxian principles leave no room for doubt as to whose interests they aim to serve. Those parties that take their stand squarely on Marxian principles serve but one master, the producers, as against their exploiters. Why do not the workers flock to the support of the consistent Marx-

¹ Hillquit Mayoralty Campaign, 1917.

ian parties? Why do they prefer to support the parties that compromise their Marxian principles and make an issue of reforms which have no possible bearing on exploitation at the point of production except actually to increase it?

We have shown that reforms have been initiated by capitalist governments because they have proved a blessing to the owners of the means of production. They have made for labor efficiency and thus increased the rate of exploitation. Why, then, do the exploited support Socialist parties that go back on their principles and, instead, champion reforms which serve the interests of the exploiters? Let us see if we cannot probe this mystery to the bottom.

The owners of the tools of production must have a working class developed to the highest possible point of efficiency. Experience has amply demonstrated that profits obtained at the expense of a physically undermined and mentally ignorant working class are automatically limited, for they have a tendency to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Autocratic Germany has proved to the satisfaction of international capitalism that a healthy, educated working class is capable of yielding profits undreamed of heretofore. In an effort to tap this new source of profits, other capitalist governments are following Germany's example and are introducing reforms that are calculated to develop a healthy, educated working class.

So we see the capitalist governments of England and the United States (Germany's chief rivals)

introducing industrial and social reforms that aim to regulate the hours of labor, conditions of labor, protection of child labor, regulation of the labor of women, liability insurance, health insurance, free public and high school education, free libraries, free baths, free hospitals, etc., etc.

Should labor oppose these reforms? That is an idle question. The fact is, the masses lined up behind the capitalist governments, in a demand for the immediate enactment of these reforms. It appears that capital and labor have some interests in common after all! Labor had its choice. The class struggle at the point of production dictated that labor should oppose these reforms because they made for an increased ratio of exploitation. But their interests as consumers, as social beings, dictated support to the reform measures. We know that it was the dictates of the latter that prevailed. Reforms improve the social status of the masses and for that reason command their support.

The masses have progressed and progressed rapidly, but the gains come to them not as producers, but as consumers, as social beings. Practically the entire list of industrial and social reforms aim to serve the masses in their capacity as consumers and social beings.

CHAPTER VI

ARE SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES SCIENTIFIC?

SOCIALISTS claim that of all the groups opposed to the capitalist system they alone are scientific. What is the basis for this sweeping claim? Socialist principles, we are told, are based on the science and laws of Social Evolution. A study of the processes of Social Evolution of the past seventy-five years discloses the remarkable fact that *there is a conflict between Socialist principles and Social Evolution*. Socialist principles concern themselves with the welfare of the producer, whereas Social Evolution concerns itself with the welfare of the consumer. Socialist principles concern themselves with productive capital while Social Evolution concerns itself with consumable wealth. Socialist principles concern themselves with exploitation at the point of production, while Social Evolution concerns itself with exploitation at the point of consumption. Socialist principles concern themselves with the means of production of social wealth, Social Evolution concerns itself with the distribution of social wealth. Socialist principles are based on the conflict of in-

terest between the owners of the means of production and the workers, whereas Social Evolution *operates in response to their common interests*.

The class struggle at the point of production appears to be entirely ignored by Social Evolution.

How is it possible to make scientific claims for principles that conflict with Social Evolution? It becomes evident that inasmuch as Socialist principles are not based upon, but conflict with, Social Evolution, they cannot be scientific and therefore must be Utopian.

How is it with the practical program of the International Socialist movement? What relation does it bear to Social Evolution? We have seen that the practical program is not based on Socialist theoretical principles, but was arrived at empirically as a political expediency, or, as Hillquit puts it, "Not as the result of the reasoned policy of the leaders, but yielding to the instinct of the masses." It is admitted that the phenomenal growth of the International Socialist movement is entirely due to this step. It was forced upon the Socialists by the masses and new adherents by the millions were attracted by it. Contrary to the theoretical principles, this practical program of reform concerns itself with the masses' welfare as consumers, aiming to further their social interests, and it is because these interests are paramount to the workers that they flock to the Party making them the issue. Wherever there are two Socialist parties in the field it is not the one that makes an issue of their interests as producers that

attracts the support of the masses, but the one that champions their interests as consumers.

Clearly it is the practical program so empirically arrived at by a "scientific" movement that conforms to the operations of Social Evolution.

This conflict between theory and practice, this failure to understand which is scientific, constitutes the supreme tragedy of Socialism.

Socialists hold fast to the view that the principles which concern themselves with the welfare of the producer and with productive capital are scientific; *i.e.*, are based upon the laws of Social Evolution. In practice, however, they repudiate these principles and present a program based upon the welfare of the consumer and the distribution of consumable wealth.

A recent and striking illustration of the conflict between Socialist theory and practice is to be had in the remarkable mayoralty campaign of New York City in 1917. Socialists will not soon forget the ecstatic enthusiasm which was the outstanding feature of that unprecedented campaign. Let us see what Hillquit made Socialism stand for.

In an interview¹ Hillquit offered a program which he pledged himself to adopt and which included medical care of poor mothers before and after child-birth, municipal nurseries, better schools, more schools and meals supplied by the city to poor children.

When asked to answer a list of questions submitted

¹ *New York World*, October 6, 1917.

by a Labor Food Conference to each candidate, Hillquit replied in no uncertain terms. His most comprehensive answer was:

If elected, I would have the city enter the food market as far as necessary to eliminate profiteering and waste and reduce prices to a minimum whenever possible. I would do this also in the case of fuel. If necessary, I would have the city buy coal direct from the mines and sell it to the people without profit. I would have the city buy milk from the farmers and sell it to the people without profit.

Now, the above is a good illustration of Socialist practical concern in the welfare of the masses as consumers.

Following the election, Hillquit was invited to address the State Woman Suffrage Party. Hillquit is reported¹ as having laid down the fundamental proposition that "*Socialism is not concerned with consumable wealth, but only with productive capital.*"

How is it possible to reconcile this statement with his platform during the campaign? Is it possible that Socialists are only interested in consumable wealth during election time, and only for the purpose of vote-catching? In laying down the proposition that Socialism is not concerned with consumable wealth, but only with productive capital, Hillquit adhered strictly to the theoretical principles upon which the party is based, but how much of a furore would he have created had he made his campaign on those principles? It will not do to say that as Mayor of New York City, Hillquit could not promise much

¹ *New York Call*, January 9, 1918 (my italics).

in the way of concerning himself with productive capital. Hillquit waged his campaign not only on local, but national and even international issues.

In a desire to attract strong political support, Socialist parties feel *intuitively* that they must suspend their theoretical principles and wage their campaign not upon the class struggle at the point of production, but upon issues that concern the great mass of the people as *citizens and consumers*.

Socialists are so busy studying the contradictions of capitalism that they have no time to observe their own. They tell us that a program of immediate demands is *not only useless, but it is criminal*, then they immediately proceed to frame immediate demand planks. Ask a Socialist, why do capitalist governments grant reforms and his answer will always be: "Because they are frightened by the growing Socialist vote."

But what does capitalism lose through granting these reforms? How is this loss to be translated in terms of Surplus Value and the class struggle? It is all shrouded in deep mystery. But whether it can be explained or not, reforms though not demanded on grounds of Socialist principles must be concessions from the capitalist class, for the formula states that labor and capital can have no interests in common. Other factions, however, insist that reforms are but a capitalist trick to wean the Socialists away from the real revolutionary path.

Where must we look for the cause of this endless confusion and these innumerable contradictions?

Is it due to a faulty interpretation of Marxian principles? Is it due to a faulty application of Marxian principles, or is it with the Marxian principles themselves that there is something fundamentally wrong? We cannot hope to find an answer to questions so far-reaching in their nature except through an exhaustive study of the theoretical principles formulated by Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific Socialism. This, then, is the task that is set before us.

CHAPTER VII

MARXIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

These two great discoveries—the materialistic conception of history and the revelation of the secret of capitalistic production through surplus value—we owe to Marx. With these discoveries Socialism became a science. . . .

From that time forward Socialism was no longer an accidental discovery of this or that ingenious brain, but the necessary outcome of the struggle between two historically developed classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.—FREDRICH ENGELS, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*.

Socialism as a scheme calculated to improve the material conditions of human society was rejected by Marx as Utopian. History had taught him that social systems cannot be changed at will. He had discovered that social systems are but a reflex of their economic foundation, and therefore cannot be changed except as there has been a change in the economic foundation.

The class struggle is the outstanding phenomenon of all past history, and is always the product of the economic conditions of a given epoch.

The class war in the present capitalist system of society arises from the fact that Surplus Value is extracted from labor by the owners of the means of production.

What is the usual outcome of this class struggle which has raged in all history? Marx tells us¹ that the fight each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society-at-large or in the common ruin of the contending classes. Assuming that the class struggle in a given epoch did not end in the common ruin of the contending classes, but brought about a revolutionary reconstitution of society, how was this accomplished? Was it a sudden, quick change? Was it a slow, drawn-out, continuous process, or was it an intermittent process? Marx does not leave us in doubt as to his answer when he says:

At a *certain stage* in their development the material productive forces of society come into opposition with the existing conditions of production or what is only a legal expression for it, with the relations of property within which they have hitherto moved. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations change into fetters. Then enters an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the whole gigantic superstructure (the legal and political organizations to which certain social forms of consciousness correspond) is more slowly or more quickly overthrown.²

Applying these general principles to the development of the bourgeoisie, Marx says:

In the development of these (bourgeois) means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organization of agriculture and manufacturing industry; in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.³

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 13.

² Quoted by E. Bernstein—*Evolutionary Socialism*, p. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

In laying down his general principles and in citing a specific instance of their practical application, Marx left no room for the misinterpretation of his law of social change. He showed that social change is not a continuous but an intermittent process. At a *certain stage* in their development the material forces of society come into opposition with the existing conditions of production. . . . Then enters an "epoch of social revolution."

But what of the intervening time? What happens between the certain stage of one epoch and the arrival of the certain stage in the next epoch? Marx leaves us in the dark as to this. Apparently nothing of importance can happen, nothing of social significance. Society apparently leaps forward from *certain stage* to *certain stage*, the intervening time presumably being consumed in gathering itself for the next leap.

That this was undoubtedly his view, a further quotation will amply confirm. "With the change of the economic *foundation*," says Marx, "the whole gigantic superstructure is more slowly or more quickly overthrown." Now, what other meaning can the word *foundation* have than the *entire* basis or at least the greater portion of the basis, a change which obviously cannot be accomplished in a short interval of time. Yet even when the foundation has been changed the whole superstructure is only "more slowly or more quickly overthrown"; in other words, the change in the superstructure lags tardily behind the change in the economic founda-

tion. It must be evident that to Marx social change is not a continuous, but an intermittent process, and that the period intervening between the *certain stage* of economic development of one epoch and the *certain stage* of the next is not worthy of study, as it has no real social significance.

Yet at another place we find him saying:

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without *constantly* revolutionizing the instruments of production and thereby the relations of production and with them the whole relations of society.¹

This statement is entirely at variance with his law of social progress as quoted above. It speaks of the process as continuous, with the inevitable change in the superstructure. To Marx the bourgeois epoch furnishes the exception which but proves his rule.

Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation *distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones*. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes.²

Thus does Marx prove his law that social progress is an intermittent process with nothing of social value occurring in the intervals.

Now let us observe the workings of Marx's law of intermittent social progress and note the logic of its conclusions. The bourgeois modes of production and exchange were evolved in feudal society. What was the status of the exploited class, pending the

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 17.

² *Ibid.* (my italics).

arrival of the "certain stage" in the development of these means of production and exchange that would compel feudal society to "burst asunder"? As has already been stated, for Marx this period was of little social significance. In developing his subject, however, he was compelled to comment upon the status of the exploited and note the tendency. He tells us, for instance, that "from the serfs of the middle ages *sprang* the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were *developed*."¹

This statement with the word *sprang* used in that sense, and the word *developed*, can convey but one meaning—a tendency to advance, to progress.

Again: "Each step in the *development* of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding *political advance* of that class."² There is no mistaking the meaning of that statement.

It must be evident that even in the classic examples of Marx's law of intermittent social progress; those epochs in which "conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form was the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes," the intervening periods showed a progressive upward tendency in the condition of the exploited.

Now, let us study the position of the exploited in bourgeois society. Marx tells us that bourgeois society is the exception to his law of social change; the law that social change can come only with a certain stage in the development of the means of

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

production and exchange. But "bourgeois society cannot exist without *constantly* revolutionizing the instruments of production and thereby the relations of production and with them the whole relations of society."

How does this *constant change* affect the status of the exploited? In the earlier epochs change was synonymous with progress, with improvement, the only objection being its exasperatingly slow and intermittent character. But bourgeois society, being an exception in that *constant* change is its outstanding characteristic, does this characteristic redound to the advantage of the exploited by accelerating the rate of progress beyond anything experienced in previous epochs? That might be a logical deduction, but, according to Marx, illogic is the only logical thing about bourgeois society. Not only are we wrong in concluding that the rate of progress is greater in bourgeois society, but it is a mistake to believe that there is any progress at all. Not only is there no progress with the progress of industry, but actual retrogression. Marx also insists¹ that in all previous epochs, including the feudal, development meant *advance*, but in bourgeois society the modern laborer, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class.

Thus does Marx prove the folly of logic. Constant change as the exceptional and distinguishing feature of bourgeois society, not only does not bring with it

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 31.

exceptional progress for the exploited, but actually makes for retrogression insofar as the status of the exploited is concerned. An exception to every exception is, according to Marx, the outstanding characteristic of bourgeois society. Bourgeois society, like a crab, makes progress backwards. Bourgeois society refuses to respond to any of the laws that governed past history. It has broken away from all control, it creates its own social laws, it is a law unto itself. This is the only explanation Marx could offer for the maze of exceptions manifested by bourgeois society to the laws he had evolved.

According to Marx's theory, progress can bring nothing but reaction and pauperism to the proletariat. To him this is an immutable law peculiar to bourgeois society.

Such was Marx's understanding of the intervening period. Let us now turn to the period upon which Marx concentrated most of his analytical powers—the period of social revolution that entered with the arrival of a "certain stage in the development of the means of production and exchange."

Marx laid down as a universal law that "at a certain stage in their development the material productive forces of society come into opposition with the existing conditions of production . . . from forms of development of the forces of production these relations change into fetters and then enters an epoch of social revolution."

Applying this law to bourgeois society, what would be the logical expectation? Would it not be natural

to suppose that whatever might have been the cause of the freakish paradox which in bourgeois society made development mean degradation, when the stage of social revolution was at last reached, it would mean for the proletariat what social revolution always has meant for the exploited—a stage of accelerated progress? But Marx quickly disillusioned us. Not even at the stage of social revolution does bourgeois society come within the scope of his law. Yes, his was a universal law, but bourgeois society refuses to be governed by it!

Let us compare the status of the exploited at the stage of social revolution in feudal society with that of bourgeois society. "We see, then, the means of production and of exchange on whose foundation the bourgeois *built itself up* were generated in feudal society. At a *certain stage* in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. Into their places stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adopted to it and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class."¹

The rise, growth and final mastery of the bourgeoisie over the feudal system stands out as a classic example of the operation of Marx's law. Here we

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 20.

have conveyed to us a picture of a final victory which is the culmination of the ever-increasing strength of the exploited with a corresponding weakening of the exploiting class.

Compare this with the picture he paints of the condition of the proletariat at the same period of development of the productive forces that gives rise to an epoch of social revolution. For even when Marx wrote (1848), the epoch of social revolution had already been in operation for many a decade past. Did this epoch bring with it for the proletariat the changes that a similar epoch in feudal society brought to the bourgeoisie? Here is Marx's answer:

Hitherto every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune just as the petty bourgeois; under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern laborer *on the contrary*, instead of *rising* with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state that it has to feed him instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie; in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.¹

¹*Communist Manifesto*, p. 31 (my italics.)

Thus we see that while in all past history an epoch of social revolution, which entered as a result of the conflict of the new productive forces with the old conditions of production, was accompanied by a vast improvement in the condition of the exploited at the expense of the exploiters, the epoch of social revolution in bourgeois society arising also from a change in the mode of production is accompanied by the very opposite social phenomena: increasing strength of the bourgeoisie and the complete pauperization of those who are to overthrow the bourgeoisie, not through their increasing strength, but through their increasing misery will the exploited conquer the exploiters!

The absurdity of this conclusion ought to be apparent to the most superficial thinker. "The bourgeoisie is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him." How can this situation be made the basis for a demand that the bourgeoisie be abolished? Is Marx seeking to protect the interests of a useless class? If Marx is right and economic evolution is going to eliminate the proletariat as a factor in production, therefore the proletariat will no longer feed the bourgeoisie—that is, it will no longer be exploited; then why adopt a reactionary measure? If evolution has brought about a condition which makes the bourgeoisie useful and the proletariat useless, then why turn back the hand of time? Be-

sides, isn't the bourgeoisie rendering a useful service by feeding the useless proletariat? The situation is certainly puzzling. Hasn't the middle class—the small manufacturer, petty bourgeois, feudal lord, etc.—an equal if not greater justification for demanding the abolition of bourgeois rule? They at least have the prestige of having at one time been the ruling class. They have a right to demand that bourgeois rule be abolished and their own restored. Should Social Evolution, then, proceed in the interest of these opponents of the bourgeoisie? But let us go on with our study of Marx.

"All previous historical movements," says Marx, "were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities." This is handed down by Marx as a law which has operated in all past history. Is this a universal law? Will future history also respond to this law?

No, says Marx; what was the law in all past history will not be the law of future history. Future history will be so different that it must have laws that are different. "The proletarian movement," says Marx, "is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority." Let us now follow Marx in his description of this new law, which is to operate in the interest of the immense majority.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled *civil war*, raging within existing society up to the point where *that war*

*breaks out into open revolution and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.*¹

We find the same views expressed in the following language:

*The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeoisie supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.*²

There is certainly nothing contradictory in these two statements, neither is there any ambiguity as to their meaning. Civil war between bourgeoisie and proletariat—revolution—violent overthrow of bourgeoisie—sway of the proletariat. But where in all this is to be found the “immense majority” and Socialism? Is the sway of the proletariat Socialism? Did all the other proletarian parties seek to establish Socialism? What did they know about Socialism? Wasn’t the *Communist Manifesto* the first presentation of “scientific” Socialist principles? Or is “the formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of bourgeoisie supremacy,” synonymous with Socialism? What choice have we but to accept this conclusion? But Marx had more to say on this point. Perhaps he will help us out of our dilemma.

He says:

We have seen above that the *first step in the revolution by the working class* is to raise the proletariat to the position of *ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.*³

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 30 (my italics).

² *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

We might stop here to inquire in what way does the *raising of the proletariat to the position of the ruling class* constitute winning the battle of democracy? Is bourgeois class rule synonymous with democracy? Does class rule become “democracy” when the proletariat is the ruling class? Now let us understand correctly just how Socialism will be brought about.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest *by degrees* all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, *i.e.*, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movements outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order *and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.*¹

This statement is followed up with a series of social reform planks.

Now where are we at? We are to have civil war, which is to break out into open revolution, violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie and supremacy of the proletariat. “The first step in the revolution is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class.”

What mental picture does such a description project before us? Civil wars and violent revolutions are no Sunday-school picnics. They bring

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, pp. 44-45 (my italics.)

chaos, destruction, famine and ruthless butchery. Upon none do these fall with more crushing force than upon the proletariat. The idealism which will inspire the proletariat to sacrifice life in defense of a noble cause, demands that the prize be worthy of the sacrifice. The proletariat who, by revolution, seeks to overthrow the supremacy of the bourgeoisie, must be prepared not only to risk its own life, but must stand ready to spill the blood of members of its own class who may happen to wear the uniform of the State.

Let us assume the revolution is on and at last is won. By paying the full price in anguish and blood, the proletariat has raised itself to the position of the ruling class. What is the reward? Socialism? The Co-operative Commonwealth? Not at all! The proletariat, according to Marx, will use its *political supremacy* to wrest, *by degrees*, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i.e.*, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class, etc., and then, and then—proceed to enact a series of social reform measures!

Although the State is now “the proletariat organized as the ruling class, . . . Marx tells us these reforms “are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.”

We commend these views to Lenin and Trotsky, who are trying to establish Socialism in Russia as the logical outgrowth of what?

What is the nature of the reforms suggested by

Marx? Why, most of them haven't the slightest bearing on exploitation at the point of production, but concern themselves chiefly with the welfare of the workers as consumers, as social beings.

"The proletariat," says Marx, "will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to *centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State*, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class." But why will the proletariat do this; why *should* the proletariat do this; because Marx would have it so? Is this the scientific basis for his conclusion? In what way would this method serve labor in its aim? Marx has taught labor that its misery is due to the fact that it is exploited by the capitalist class at the point of production and labor is forced to submit to this exploitation because the capitalist class controls the means of production. It is this situation that is responsible for the class struggle, which can only come to an end through a proletarian revolution.

But what is there in all this that would indicate that Socialism must follow the revolution? With the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, every evil for which it has been responsible disappears with it. Labor is now in control of the means of production. Exploitation at the point of production comes to an end. Surplus Value becomes a thing of the past; the class struggle has been fought and won; the "dictatorship of the proletariat" proclaimed at last. But where is Socialism, or is all this Socialism?

If this isn't Socialism, if Socialism implies the

ownership of the social means of production by society as a whole, in what way can it be to the economic interest of the proletariat, now that it has established its dictatorship, to give up to society the ownership of the means of production? The proletariat has no longer any grievance to be remedied. It is no longer exploited, it no longer creates Surplus Value, the class struggle is ended; why not leave well enough alone? Why give up the ownership of the means of production to society-at-large? Didn't the proletariat have enough experience with the ownership of the means of production in the hands of "outsiders"? It is all beyond comprehension.

But Marx insists that the proletariat will give up the ownership of the means of production to society as a whole; that is, it will establish Socialism. He states his belief in the following language:

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society-at-large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletariat cannot become masters of the productive forces of society except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. *They have nothing of their own to secure and fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurance of, individual property.*¹ [My italics.]

This view is amplified as follows:

If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled by the force of circumstances to organize itself as a class, if by means of a revolution it makes itself the ruling class, and as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production,

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 30.

then it will along with these conditions have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.¹ [My italics.]

No historian describing recorded facts of history could speak in more certain terms than does Marx in detailing his views of the future. But where are the facts to prove his dogmatic assertions? He had none to offer.

"The proletariat cannot become masters of the productive forces of society except by abolishing their previous mode of appropriation." That we may readily grant. Once the proletariat becomes master of the productive forces of society, their mode of appropriation is at once abolished. But does it necessarily follow from this that "they have nothing of their own to secure and fortify" and therefore it becomes their mission to destroy all previous securities for and insurance of individual property? But if the proletariat have nothing of their own to secure and fortify, on whose behalf are they to make the terrible sacrifices that form an inevitable part of every revolution? Would it not be the height of folly on the part of the proletariat, after paying the bloody price exacted by a revolution before it could obtain the mastery over the productive forces of society, that it should fail to fortify its control over those forces? Had it not already worked out its historic mission when it had abolished its previous mode of appropriation? Had it not solved the problem

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 46.

of exploitation and the class struggle through its mastery over the productive forces of society? Isn't it now in a position to obtain "the full product of its toil"? Why should the now emancipated proletariat be expected to go beyond its own interests?

But Marx insists that when the proletariat, by means of a revolution, will conquer the bourgeoisie and become the ruling class, instead of maintaining its position as ruling class—which apparently it holds without subjecting anyone to exploitation and which but serves to secure itself against future exploitation—it will abolish its own supremacy as a class. And now what is to be the physical and moral standard of the proletariat that is to prove not only equal to the task of overthrowing the powerfully entrenched bourgeoisie, but in addition to this, carry through a task that no master class of any previous epoch felt possessed of the power to accomplish, that of abolishing its own supremacy as a class? Here is Marx's own description:

The modern laborer instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper. . . . The bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society . . . because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within its slavery; because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him.¹

Such is to be the physical and moral state of the class that is to overthrow the bourgeoisie, itself become the ruling class, and then rise to the heights

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 36.

of abolishing its own supremacy as a class. And this view is offered in the name of science!

Karl Kautsky seems to realize that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is not synonymous with Socialism. He joins Marx in granting the proletariat virtues hitherto unrevealed in human relations, virtues which will prompt the victorious proletariat to give up to society the fruits of its hard-won victory. Kautsky, however, differs from Marx in that he allows such sublime virtues to the proletariat with a mental reservation. He can see the possibility of the proletariat failing to show the altruism expected of it.

"If the working class," says Kautsky, "did not make use of its mastery over the machinery of government to introduce the Socialist system of production, the logic of events would finally call some such system into being—but only after a useless waste of energy and time."¹

Lenine and Trotsky are certainly Marxians. They have won the battle of "democracy"! They have, through a violent revolution, overthrown the bourgeoisie and established the dictatorship of the proletariat. Have they created conditions that are likely to sweep away class antagonisms and of classes generally? Are there any indications of a deep-seated plot hatched by Lenine and Trotsky, the purpose of which is to abolish their own supremacy? Has anyone heard of any? Surely, news to this effect does not reach the ears of their "Comrades"

¹ *Class Struggle*, p. 191.

with the speed that lies behind the bullets that Lenine and Trotsky direct at the hearts of their "Comrades."

Lenine and Trotsky have out-Marxed Marx. They believe in bettering the instructions. Marx¹ held that after the proletariat had overthrown the bourgeoisie and raised itself to the position of the ruling class it should proceed to put into effect a series of social reform measures, and this even "in the most advanced countries."

But Lenine and Trotsky are modern Marxians. They will have nothing to do with social reforms. Is Russia industrially one of the most backward countries in the world? Lenine and Trotsky are above such trifles. Historically created conditions? Nonsense! "Dictatorship of the proletariat!"

And yet the chaos, the anarchy, the famine, the fratricide that are to-day the tragedy and despair of Russia are the direct result of the practical application of Marxian principles. The inherent contradictions which form the rock upon which the entire International Socialist movement has been smashed, we have now traced back to the theories formulated by Marx.

Our analysis of the *Communist Manifesto* has disclosed a series of contradictions which must prove fatal to the claim that the theories are based upon the laws of Social Evolution. We are compelled to raise the question whether Marx's arduous labors had really been crowned with success. Did Marx

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 45.

discover the laws of Social Evolution? Did he place Socialism upon a scientific basis? From the contradictions we have noted and from the impotency of the International Socialist movement, it would require no little courage to hold tenaciously to the belief that Marx had actually attained the purpose to which he had devoted his life.

Marx believed that the class struggle is the dynamic force of social progress. The economic interests of the owners of the means of production must invariably conflict with the interests of the wage-earners. This conflict, thought Marx, furnishes the basic motive for social progress. Marx was not the first to discern the presence of the class struggle in history, but he was the first to assign to this struggle the role of the propelling power in social progress. This point was strongly emphasized by Marx's disciples, when he was accused of adopting the class struggle theory from others. Kautsky's defense serves as a noteworthy example. It reads:

But wherein consists the particular merit of the *Communist Manifesto*, if the so-called theories of increasing misery and concentration of capital were acknowledged by the other Socialists of their time, if they all based their Socialism upon the economic tendencies of the capitalist mode of production?

This merit consisted first of all in the fact that these theories appeared more clear-cut in the *Manifesto* than in any other Socialist publication of their time; and secondly in the conception of the role of the class struggle as *THE DRIVING FORCE in social development and in the application of this conception to the proletarian struggle*. Of this the majority of the other Socialists had *ABSOLUTELY NO IDEA* and especially in that group to

which Considérant belonged, the class struggle was considered a most deplorable error. To be sure, both Considérant and his associates acknowledged the existence of the class struggle, but they did not see how inevitably it grew out of the economic development, *and prepared the way for the new order of things.*¹

It is now more than seventy years since Marx has given us his class struggle theory as the propelling force in Social Evolution. It formed the basis for most of his prophecies.

Seventy years of history have put Marx's principles and prophecies to the test, and what has been the verdict? Has modern history vindicated Marxian principles? Has there been any social progress? Has it been attained through the class struggle at the point of production? Has it been attained at the expense of the owners of the means of production? Has modern history proven Marx's claim that the owners of the means of production and the workers cannot have any interests in common? Has modern history conformed to Marx's law that man is swayed in his actions by his interests as a producer?

Marx himself noted that bourgeois society offered a good many exceptions to his universal laws of Social Evolution. Not so many, to be sure, as we have noted above, but he recounted a number of exceptions nevertheless. Is it possible that bourgeois society is an exception even to the class struggle theory? Has the class struggle been the propelling motive power of social progress in all past history,

¹ *Das Kommunistische Manifest ein Plagiat, Neue Zeit, Jahre, XXIV, 1906, vol. xi, p. 698.* Quoted by Siinkhovich, pp. 150-151. (My italics.)

but on discovery of her secret did history drop this law and formulate a new one?

How did Marx come to discover that the class struggle is the dynamic force in history? Frederick Engels admits us into the secret. It is contained in this passage:

Whilst, however, the revolution in the conception of Nature could only be made in proportion to the corresponding positive materials furnished by research, already much earlier, *certain historical facts had occurred which led to a decisive change in the conception of history*. In 1831 the first working-class rising took place in Lyons; between 1838 and 1842 the first national working-class movement, that of the English Chartists, reached its height. *The class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie came to the front in the history of the most advanced countries in Europe*, in proportion to the development, upon the one hand, of modern industry, upon the other of the newly acquired political supremacy of the bourgeoisie. *Facts more and more strenuously gave the lie to the teachings of bourgeois economy as to the identity of the interests of capital and labor*, as to the universal harmony and universal prosperity that would be the consequence of unbridled competition! *All these things could no longer be ignored any more than the French and English Socialism, which was their theoretical though very imperfect expression*. But the old idealist conception of history, which was not yet dislodged, *knew nothing of class struggles, based upon economic interests*, knew nothing of economic interests, production and all economic relations appeared in it only as incidental, subordinate elements in "the history of civilization."

The new facts made imperative a new examination of all past history. Then it was seen that all past history with the exception of its primitive stages *was the history of class struggles*; that these warring classes of society are always the product of the modes of production and of exchange—in a word, of the *economic conditions of their time*; that the economic structure of society

always furnishes the real basis starting from which we can alone work out the ultimate explanation of the whole superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical and other ideas of a given historical period. Hegel had freed history from metaphysics—he had made it dialectic—but his conception of history was essentially idealistic. But now idealism was driven from its last refuge, the philosophy of history; now a materialistic treatment of history was propounded and a method found of explaining man's "knowing" by his "being," instead of as heretofore his "being" by his "knowing."

From that time forward Socialism was no longer an accidental discovery of this or that ingenious brain, but the *necessary outcome of the struggle between two historically developed classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie*. Its task was no longer to manufacture a system of society as perfect as possible, but to examine the historico-economic succession of events from which these classes and their antagonism had of necessity sprung, and to discover in the economic conditions thus created the means of ending the conflict.¹

This detailed explanation gives us a very clear understanding of the facts which inspired Marx's theory of history. Working class risings and the growth of the labor movement left a profound impression upon the mind of Marx. He could not ignore them any more than he could ignore French and English Socialism. The formulation of the class struggle theory enabled him to combine both.

The class struggle we learn from Engels, is the dynamic force in history. Between exploiters and exploited there cannot possibly be any harmony of interest.

¹ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, Engels, pp. 89-92. (My italics.)

There is yet another law formulated by Marx to which we must now turn our attention. It reads as follows:

One form of society never perishes before all the productive forces are evolved for which it is sufficiently comprehensive and new or higher conditions of production never step on to the scene before the material conditions of existence of the same have come to light out of the womb of the old society.¹

What relation does this law bear to the class-struggle theory? Are they both part of the same universal law? Do they complement each other? Do they prove each other or do they contradict each other? Let us see.

The bourgeoisie has sprung from the oppressed classes in feudal society. It went through a long course of development. It had to develop the material conditions as a basis for the new form of society.

The basis of existence for the new master class was proletarian exploitation. What attitude did the proletariat assume toward the bourgeois? Marx furnishes the answer:

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its *birth* begins its *struggle* with the bourgeoisie. . . . At this stage the laborers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they united to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage,

¹ *A Contribution to the Criticism of Political Economy.*

therefore, the proletariat do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the nonindustrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeois. Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.¹

Now, why did the proletarians "fight the enemies of their enemies" when every victory so obtained was a victory for the bourgeoisie? Would a victory for the bourgeoisie mean for the proletariat a reduction in the rate of exploitation? Hardly. No master class in all history has enjoyed a rate of exploitation comparable to that of the bourgeoisie. No one knew this better than Marx. Yet the proletariat fought the battles for the bourgeoisie. What becomes of the class-struggle theory?

Again: The Socialist system of society no more than any previous system cannot "step on to the scene before the material conditions of existence of the same have come to light out of the womb of the old society." And this is not the only condition; there is yet another. The bourgeois system of society, like its predecessors, "will not perish before all the productive forces are evolved for which it is sufficiently comprehensive." It is therefore to the interest of the proletariat and all others who would speed the day for Socialism, to help or at least not hinder, the development of the capitalist system to its utmost in the shortest possible time. But the capitalist class, too, is straining every nerve towards

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, pp. 25-26.

the same identical end. It cannot rest for an instant. It is working at fever heat in an effort to attain the highest possible point of development.

Question: Is Socialism to be the outcome of *conflict* of interests? It is beginning to appear that we must go to Marx for an effectual refutation of Marx.

That Marx has erred fundamentally must be apparent to all save those who are but blind worshippers. But specifically what is the nature of his errors?

Is he wrong in his contention that all social systems have an economic foundation and that each system can be explained only through an understanding of its economic basis? Many an attempt has been made to upset this theory and each has reacted to the discomfiture of the challenger.

Is he wrong in his theory that social systems change in response to a change in the mode of production and exchange? No one, as yet, has successfully refuted that doctrine. Is he right in his claim that in all previous society there have been classes and class struggles and that the present capitalist system is no exception?

Is his "surplus value" theory as the genesis of the class struggle in capitalist society sound? None of these has been or can be refuted.

Where, then, has Marx erred? How can his errors be demonstrated? Marx's errors must be sought not in his theories, but in his *interpretation* of his theories. Marx's failures are not due to his discoveries, but to the *significance* he attributed to his discoveries.

Marx set himself the task of explaining social systems. He succeeded. To Marx belongs the glory of having discovered that social systems have an economic foundation and explanation. But what is the true significance of these discoveries? In making the discovery that society has an economic foundation and that a class struggle has been an inseparable phenomenon of every epoch, Marx believed that he had discovered the laws of Social Evolution. But what he discovered and described with such infinite detail were not the *laws* and operations of Social Evolution, but manifestations of the *effects* of the operations of the laws of Social Evolution.

Marx did not deal with causes, but with effects, which he mistook for causes.

Marx did not discover the laws of Social Evolution. He knew nothing of the operations of the laws of Social Evolution.

If these facts can be successfully established we will, at the same time, have established: (1) that Marxian principles are not based upon the laws of Social Evolution, and therefore are not scientific, but Utopian; (2) that Marxian principles are not social, but anti-social; (3) that the one difference between Marxian Utopianism and the Utopianism of St. Simon and others is that St. Simon sought to bring about Socialism through social means, while Marxists aim to bring about Socialism through anti-social means.

As to all this, we are content to build and rest our case upon the accumulated facts of history.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SOCIAL INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

If the Marxian laws of Social Evolution must be rejected, how are the true laws of Social Evolution to be determined?

A study of the outstanding phenomena of history brings to light the fact that the propelling motive power behind all social change is the quest for a solution to the problem of existence. Man has been forced under penalty of extinction to concentrate his energies upon this universal quest. All past history is but a record of trials and experiences man has encountered in his efforts to make secure his earthly existence. The will to live is the universal economic problem.

Organized society came into existence as the result of experience that taught the lesson of mankind's common problem and of the realization that its solution is more likely to be attained through the co-operation of all having a common aim.

All social advance has been registered not as the result of conflict of interest at the point of production, but in response to the common interests of the majority as social beings. Social Evolution always

operates in response to this universal law. The end and aim of all social progress is the solution to the problem of existence.

The class struggle is an effect, not a cause. It is due to insecurity in the means of existence. It is to the interest of society as a whole to eliminate the cause.

In proportion as society advances in its efforts to eliminate the cause do the effects disappear.

The economic interests of the majority as consumers coincide and society advances in response to the economic interests of the majority as social beings and consumers.

Each previous form of society has been called into existence as a gradual outgrowth of the preceding epoch and represented a distinct social advance. The test for any form of society is the ability of its productive forces to supply the wants of society. Failure to measure up to this test makes its doom inevitable. Gradually there are evolved new productive forces that promise to come closer to the solution of some specific needs. Society as a whole is to that extent enriched.

The old method must yield to the new and thus the old order with the form of exploitation peculiar to it is to that degree eliminated. The new order is evolved within the framework of the old in response to the social interests of the majority. The majority is usually formed through a combination of the powerful and the useful as against the remnants of the past and the useless of the present.

But we know that no previous order has done away with exploitation. The new epoch, evolved as a means of better fulfilling the needs of society brought with it the emancipation of the exploited under the old epoch. But from this group arose the new master class with the improved productive forces under its control. It was now the turn of this class to exploit. The improved method of production made the rate of exploitation of the new master class far greater than that to which it had itself been subjected. This is a universal law in social progress. Nevertheless, the *higher* economic interests of the exploited were far more secure under the new epoch and their place in the social scale represented a distinct advance over the position of the exploited class in the preceding epoch. Their improved condition as consumers and as social beings were the considerations that united the exploited of the new epoch to their exploiters, thus forming the majority against the remnant of the past and the useless of the present.

In their economic interests as social beings, as consumers, all groups in society have many more interests in common than those over which they differ; social progress, therefore, is registered mainly in the interests of consumers. Social systems change with a change in the mode of production, but modes of production change because they fail to solve the problem of existence.

It is not economic evolution which gives rise to Social Evolution, but it is Social Evolution which

dictates economic evolution. Social Evolution in its aim to solve the problem of existence has evolved the social mode of production. The social system adopted to the social mode of production is in the process of evolution, shaping itself in response to the social interests of the majority. It is not *overproduction* but *underproduction* which is the outstanding historic threat to the capitalist mode of production. Socialism will be realized through a movement of consumers and not a movement of producers.

The theories here formulated we group under the general heading of the social interpretation of history. Economics, *i.e.*, the solution of the problem of existence, forms its foundation. Marx's materialistic conception of history explains effects, not causes, and as a result has everything inverted. He tells us that Economic Evolution gives rise to Social Evolution. That social production is the result of the operation of antisocial principles—competition between capitalists and conflict of interest between capital and labor—that Socialism will be brought about through the operation of an antisocial law—the class struggle. Social progress, we are told, responds to the interests of producers. Marx's conception of history made it impossible for him to point out a universal law of social progress operating throughout the several epochs recorded in history. He therefore found it necessary to give us two laws, namely:

“All *previous* historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities,” while “the prole-

tarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority."

Marx's belief that the modern laborer, instead of rising with the progress of industry, must sink deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class, is also based upon his conception of history. To Marx, no social progress was possible except through revolution. In 1850 Marx wrote as follows:

The only solution of the ten-hour problem, as of all problems arising from the antagonism of capital and labor, is the *proletarian revolution*.¹

Marx was a social pathologist. He studied social pathology and mistook the phenomena he observed for the laws of social biology. The manifestations of the class struggle are symptoms of social pathology analogous to such symptoms as pain, heat, redness and swelling in human pathology. The former are no more the laws of sociology than the latter are the laws of biology.

It is plainly to be seen that Marxian principles are not based upon an understanding of the laws of Social Evolution and therefore are not scientific, but Utopian.

¹ In Marx's *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Heft 4, London, 1850, p. 13. Quoted by Simkhovitch, in *Marxism versus Socialism*, p. 108.

CHAPTER IX

“MARXISTS” AND THE MARXIAN METHOD

WE have learned that Marxian principles are unscientific inasmuch as they are not based upon the laws of Social Evolution. The International Socialist movement, which is based upon Marxian principles, is therefore a movement devoid of scientific merit. But can we discern a distinction between Marx and “Marxists”? The distinction is so marked and outstanding that it would be an insult to his memory to couple Marx with “Marxists.”

Marx’s conclusions were wrong. They proved to be unscientific. But this does not detract in the least from the merit of his method. Marx used the scientific method. He spurned all attempts to force Social Evolution in a direction contrary to his understanding of its operations. He refused to force a social system upon society. He devoted himself to a study of society so that he might intelligently co-operate with social tendencies. Marx recognized but one master—science. Marx’s epoch-making contribution to Socialism, the contribution that transcends all else he has accomplished, is his recognition that scientific activity in behalf of Socialism must be an

activity based upon an understanding of and co-operation with the laws of Social Evolution.

Do Marx's disciples seek to prove their loyalty to Marx by using his scientific method? Not at all. Modern, scientific Socialists prove their loyalty to Marx by rejecting his methods, but worshipping his conclusions. Though Social Evolution has been sweeping onward at a speed unparalleled in Marx's time, his disciples refuse to apply his methods in an effort to explain the new phenomena, but have stood still, petrified, fixed to the spot where Marx had left them, in fear no doubt of straying from the true scientific position. Or is it out of reverence for Marx's memory? Yet it is very much to be doubted whether Marx, were he with us to-day, would see in such action any homage to him. Rather would he feel that his life work was all but wasted. He had left behind blind followers instead of intelligent disciples. Marx dared to tread in unbeaten paths. To this trait is due all that is great in Marx. Honoring Marx consists not in blindly accepting his conclusions, but in applying his methods. "*The thing which shows that the investigator of actual relations is really an orthodox Marxian,*" says Kautsky, "*is not that he thoughtlessly follows Marx, but that he applies his methods in order to understand facts.*"¹

Yet one looks in vain for a contribution which aims to apply the Marxian method for the interpretation of modern social facts. What we get instead is a monotonous repetition of the demands first voiced

¹ *Social Revolution*, p. 61.

in 1848 in the *Communist Manifesto* that the "capitalist system must be abolished"! But the capitalist system is not at all obliging. It refuses to be frightened out of existence. Why does it take so long to abolish the capitalist system and how much longer will it take? The tenacity of the capitalist system puts these scientific Socialists into a most awkward position.

A political party, such as the American Socialist Party, that year in and year out goes before the people with a demand for the overthrow of the capitalist system, forfeits all claims to science. In Marx's time such a demand had some justification. Marx believed that he had discovered the laws of Social Evolution, and his study of the causes of crises and other phenomena in capitalist society led him to believe that the collapse of capitalism was not only imminent, but long overdue. Can anyone imagine that Marx would have held to that demand if he had had any idea that after three-quarters of a century of peremptory ordering that it depart, the capitalist system would still be with us?

Marx's excoriation of Weitling's propaganda is a good indication of what his attitude would have been. Said Marx:

Tell us, Weitling, you who with your Communistic propaganda have made so much noise in Germany and have attracted so many laborers; with what arguments do you defend your social revolutionary agitation and upon what do you intend to base your agitation in the future? . . . To appeal in Germany to the workingmen *without strictly scientific and concrete doctrine is*

*tantamount to an empty-headed and conscienceless play with propaganda.*¹

Marx would have been the first to repudiate those who, though they claim to be his disciples, refuse to apply his methods in an effort to explain the seventy years of social experiences that have accumulated since his time, but insist on repeating the old demands formulated by Marx.

Where is the science that can justify a repetition of the same demands in the light of seventy years' experience with Social Evolution? Social Evolution has proved these demands to be rank Utopianism, a Utopianism so inexcusable that it would be an insult to the memory of the early Utopian bourgeois Socialists to class them together. For modern Socialists to hold fast to principles that have proved to be in opposition to the laws of Social Evolution is not the test of true Marxism, but a proof of anti-Marxism. Loyalty to science is the true test of Marxism.

Says Wilhelm Liebknecht:

We recognize no infallibility and no other authority than science, whose sphere is ever widening and *continually proves what it previously held as truths to be errors*, destroys the old decayed foundations and creates new ones; does not stand still for an instant; but in perpetual advance moves remorselessly over every dogmatic belief. . . . I maintain that no man—Marx in spite of his comprehensive and deep intellect, as little as any other—can bring science to final perfection and *this position is for everyone who understands the nature of science a foregone conclusion.*²

¹ *Die Neue Zeit.*, vol. i, 1883, p. 239. Quoted by Simkhovitch, p. 247. (My italics.)

² *No Compromise, No Political Trading*, pp. 37-38. (My italics.)

Without the scientific method there can be no scientific Socialism. This is the cardinal principle laid down by Marx. Well was he justified in his expectation that this discovery would prove a unifying and binding force to the Socialist and labor movement. It was to serve for all time as a chart, a compass that would unerringly point to the scientific method of working for Socialism—by co-operating with Social Evolution. This method would make impossible all conflicting opinion. There would be no divisions into several wings: Right, Center, Left. There would be no revolutionists, no opportunists, no impossibilists and no moderates. All these find a place in a Utopian movement in which each faction believes that it has the best scheme for bringing about Socialism. But in a scientific movement, which is based on Marx's teaching that only Social Evolution possesses the power to bring about Socialism, all unite in a study of the direction that Social Evolution appears to be taking and by co-operating help to accelerate the process.

Karl Kautsky says:

What the thinkers can do is to discover, to recognize the trend; and this they can do in proportion to the clearness of their understanding of the conditions which preceded, but they can never themselves determine the course of Social Evolution. And even the recognition of the trend of social progress has its limits. The organization of social life is most complex, even the clearest intellect finds it impossible to probe it from all sides and to measure all the forces at work in it with sufficient accuracy to enable him to foretell accurately what social forms will result from the joint action of all these forces. A new social form does

not come into existence through the activity of certain especially gifted men. . . . No one, whether he be the mightiest monarch or the wisest and most benevolent philosopher, can determine at will the direction that Social Evolution shall take or prophesy accurately the new forms that it will adopt. . . . Never yet in the history of mankind has it happened that a revolutionary party was able to foresee, let alone determine, the forms of the new social order which it strove to usher in. *The cause of progress gained much if it could as much as ascertain the tendencies that led to such a new social order, to the end that its political activity could be a conscious and not merely an instinctive one.*¹

But in spite of these teachings, modern Socialists hold to the Utopian belief that it is within their power to force Social Evolution to do their bidding. As each group seeks to force Social Evolution in the direction most appealing to the temperament of its personnel, we find hopeless division and strife, and all this at a crucial period when unity could have accomplished so much for progress and humanity.

Marxian conclusions, Marxian principles, have not stood the test of science. They are in conflict with Social Evolution. By adhering to these principles in theory, but repudiating them in practice, the Marxists paved the way for the internal strife that is to-day the tragedy of International Socialism.

The progress of Socialism and the progress of the world demand that we discard the old, unscientific principles, which are based upon the materialistic conception of history, with its theory that Social Evolution operates through class conflict and that there can be no harmony of interest between the

¹ *Class Struggle*, pp. 119-120-121-122-123. (My italics.)

owners of the means of production and the proletariat. The class struggle at the point of production is not the law of social progress. Social Evolution does not operate in the interest of producers, but in the interest of consumers. The owners of the means of production and their exploited have common social interests and Social Evolution responds to the common social interests of the majority, obtained through a combination of the powerful and the useful as against the remnant of the past and the useless of the present.

Such are the teachings of Social Evolution and these teachings invite the formulation of the social interpretation of history.

CHAPTER X

MARXIAN PRINCIPLES ANTISOCIAL

OUR analysis has brought out the astonishing revelation that the International Socialist movement is based upon principles that are neither scientific nor Socialistic, but on the contrary are both Utopian and antisocial.

As their Utopian character has already been shown, we must now point out their antisocial character.

The class-struggle theory is fundamentally anti-social. Marx was scathing in his criticism of the social appeal of the Utopian Socialism of St. Simon, Owen and Fourier. "They want to improve the condition of every member of society, even that of the most favored. Hence they habitually appeal to society-at-large, without distinction of class."¹ Marxian scientific Socialism with its class-struggle theory as the law of history must make a class appeal.

What is the basis for the class struggle in modern capitalist society?

The modern class struggle arises from the fact that capital exacts a tribute from labor in the shape of

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 60.

Surplus Value. But whence comes this Surplus Value? Surplus Value represents the difference between the wages paid to labor and the value of the products created by labor. Through their ownership of the means of production the capitalist class is in a position to compel the laborer to produce beyond the value of his wages, the difference going to the capitalist class as Surplus Value or profit. This exploitation of labor at the point of production gives rise to the class struggle—a conflict over withheld wages or Surplus Value.

These facts became revealed to Marx following an intensive study of the capitalist mode of production. He called upon the Socialists to recognize the historic significance of the class struggle at the point of production and to ally themselves on the side of the producers as against the owners of the means of production. They must help bring about a revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To expect to attain social progress through social effort appeared to Marx as the height of Utopianism. Social progress was possible only through the anti-social struggle at the point of production. A revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat must be the agencies through which to attain any measure of social progress. Until the revolution is accomplished there can be no progress, only retrogression.

Such are the theories that for more than seventy years have been acclaimed as the scientific explanation of social history and Social Evolution. Yet it is doubtful if there was ever a theory that has been

accepted as scientific by the best brains throughout the civilized world that could, through a study of Social Evolution, be so easily proven to be the height of Utopianism.

We know that society has not retrograded. It hasn't even stood still. On the contrary, society has progressed at a pace and to a point undreamed of in Marx's time.

Marx made two predictions: (1) capitalism must soon collapse; (2) there can be no social progress as long as capitalism exists. What are the facts? Capitalism has not collapsed; there *has* been social progress under capitalism.

In view of the fact that seventy years of Social Evolution has proved that Marx was mistaken and that there *can* be progress without revolution, for Marx's disciples to still hold to the revolution theory is both grotesque and pernicious. It implies an almost unbelievable blindness to the social phenomena going on about us.

Marx, were he living to-day, would readily have grasped the full significance of modern social progress. He was a student and would soon have discovered where he had been mistaken in his conceptions of the operation of Social Evolution. His was a scientific mind. He had no schemes of his own to foist upon society. He sought to understand Social Evolution in order that he might co-operate with it. In this and this only lies the great lesson of his life. But this lesson has been lost upon Socialists. Even the best of them have failed to use his scientific method,

but to this day continue to repeat formulas he published in 1848. The antisocial class struggle and proletarian revolution must be the method, they say, by which Socialism is to be brought about.

Even Karl Kautsky is a strenuous supporter of this view. In his work, *The Social Revolution*,¹ he presents his views as to how Socialism will be brought about. He says:

While the former revolutions were uprisings of the populace against the Government, the coming revolution, with the exception perhaps of Russia, will have more the character of a struggle of *one portion of the people against another*, and therein only resemble more the struggle of the Reformation than the type of the French Revolution. I might almost say that it will be much less of a sudden uprising against the authorities than a long-drawn-out *civil war*, if one does not necessarily join to these last words, the idea of actual slaughter and battles. [My italics.]

And this was written more than half a century after the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*! Social progress has stood still since Marx! Nothing has happened in the past half century that could in any way indicate how capitalism would be abolished!

Socialism, according to Kautsky, will be brought about through antisocial methods! Through civil war, through a struggle of one portion of the people against another! And organized society apparently will play no active part in this "civil war"! This is supposed to be a description of the *Social Revolution*! But Russia would probably prove an exception, was Kautsky's prediction. The Russian

¹ Pages 87-8.

Revolution, he implied, would be more on the order of former revolutions, uprisings of the populace against the Government. Weren't these, then, Social Revolutions?

We know that Kautsky's prediction was proven to the hilt. The Czar's overthrow was brought about through a general uprising of the populace against the Government. What interests us at this point is this: Why did Kautsky make an exception of Russia? The average Socialist, with an air of having said the last word upon the subject, will toss off the following answer trippingly from his tongue, "Because Russia has not yet gone through the industrial development which is a necessary preliminary to the Social Revolution." Good, but is that stating a law or describing the result of the operations of a law?

What is the underlying law which was responsible for the union of all factions against the Czar's Government and which alone made possible the impossible—a successful revolution against the Czar, accomplished practically without bloodshed? Is this a social or an antisocial law? Does it operate in response to the class struggle or in response to the interests of the majority as social beings? Did that law die with the Czar and thereafter Social Evolution was to be governed by new laws? Do new social systems bring with them new social laws or have the same laws operated throughout history, manifesting themselves in different forms in the different epochs?

Kautsky would have us believe that the law of

Social Evolution that led to the overthrow of the Czar—which he would be compelled to admit was accomplished through a social revolution—could not possibly bring about Socialism. Socialism can only be brought about through the operation of a new law, an antisocial law, “a struggle of one portion of the people against another,” through a “civil war.”

Such are Kautsky’s teachings. He stands in little danger of being accused of having originated them. At any rate it would not be difficult for him to disprove such an accusation. Marx originated them over a half century ago and Kautsky can prove it.

Lenine and Trotsky find themselves in complete agreement with Kautsky. Socialism, they say, can be brought about only through antisocial methods, through the class struggle at the point of production, through a struggle of one portion of the people against another—through civil war.

Well, how does the practical application of those principles appeal to Kautsky? He shrinks from them in horror! “A form of Asiatic Socialism,” he calls it. Oh, no, it isn’t. It is Kautsky’s teachings of Marxian principles put to practice, that’s all.

Only Lenine and Trotsky are practical men. Kautsky taught that the Social Revolution would come as the result of a civil war, if one does not necessarily join to these last words the idea of actual slaughter and battles. No wonder Lenine and Trotsky call Kautsky a back number. To them civil war without battles and slaughter is a Utopian dream. In a speech delivered at Weimar, Chancellor

Scheidemann referred to Lenine's position as follows:

We want a great world alliance in which equal nations can develop freely without the old fetters of armaments and *without the new burdens of Bolshevik civil war*. That separates us from the ideas of Lenine, who has boasted of having recommended that the abolition of disarmament should be struck off the Socialistic program because the idea of overcoming capitalism without civil war was Utopian.¹ [My italics.]

Lenine and Trotsky are absolutely right. Civil war, no more than war between nations, cannot be possible without slaughter and battles. We may as well be consistent.

But Kautsky is not the only Socialist leader who lacks the courage of his convictions. Emile Vandervelde, the Belgian Socialist, is another conspicuous example. In his latest work, he expresses himself as follows:

Statism is the organization of social labor by the State, by the Government. Socialism is the organization of social labor *by the workers grouped in public associations*. Of these two systems, the realization of the former would be conceivable without any essential change in the present relations between the classes. . . . It is not a question of replacing private capitalism by State capitalism, but private capitalism and State capitalism *by the co-operation of the workers, masters of the means of production and exchange*. And such a transformation which suppresses the distinction between capitalists and workers is nothing less than a revolution.² [My italics.]

¹ New York Times, April 12, 1919.

² Socialism versus the State.

Lenine and Trotsky are trying to carry out these principles. They are trying by means of a revolution to make the workers masters of the means of production and exchange. Does Vandervelde come to their support in this, their trying hour? Not at all. Like Kautsky, Vandervelde shrinks from the practical application of his theories. More than that, he actually repudiates the principles he laid down in his book and instead accepts the principles of State Socialism, as the following report will amply demonstrate. Vandervelde is a member of the Committee on International Labor Legislation of the Peace Conference. This committee laid before the Peace Conference a series of recommendations which were accepted and adopted.

The *New York Times* published the following¹:

Before the report was adopted, Emile Vandervelde, the Belgian labor delegate, made what was in effect a minority report. He advocated the admission to the International Labor Conference of delegates from countries with which a state of war still existed, saying that *otherwise he felt there might be held another conference at which the proletariat from all countries would be represented and which would wield more power than the conference to be held in Washington next October.* [My italics.]

Vandervelde concluded by saying that questions relative to the adoption of an eight-hour day, equality of salaries for men and women workers and legislation dealing with night work, must be settled. There are two ways to arrive at these results, he said. The *Russian way*, and the *British method*. *He preferred*

¹ April 13, 1919.

the latter. No wonder Lloyd George in his address to the House of Commons¹ in defense of his course at the Peace Conference, boasted proudly of Vandervelde's stand as follows: "A great labor orator at the Labor Conference on Friday said: 'There are two methods of dealing with the situation—the Russian method and the English method,' and I felt a thrill of pride for my country." Such is Socialist consistency in theory and practice!

Lenine and Trotsky are at least consistent. They are trying to put their principles into practice. They are calling a meeting of their own International, at which the proletariat of all countries will be represented and which Vandervelde would prefer to prevent.

According to Lloyd George, Lenine and Trotsky certainly cannot complain of unfavorable conditions for their experiment. They are trying it out in a country that is very easy to invade, but difficult to conquer.

The world is in a turmoil and heartily sick of war. No capitalist nation would dare send a large army into Russia with the intention of overthrowing Bolshevism. The masses are in no mood for such enterprises. Whether they agree with Lenine or not—and most of them probably do not—there is yet a feeling that Bolshevism seeks to serve the interests of the masses. The capitalist class of the world could not capitalize the patriotism of the masses for the purpose of invading Russia. Their hands are

¹ April 16, 1919.

full taking care of disturbances within their own countries. Then, too, there is the world's financial condition to be considered. It hardly warrants further expenditures for war purposes. Mr. George, in the speech quoted above, made reference to this situation as follows:

I share the horror for Bolshevik teaching, but I would rather leave Russia Bolshevik until she sees her way out of it *than to see Britain bankrupt. That is the surest road to Bolshevism in Britain.* [My italics.]

For this situation Lenin and Trotsky should be mighty thankful. If conditions could be made to order, they could not be improved upon. Yet, despite these advantageous conditions, can they succeed without yielding from their present uncompromising Marxian position? The answer must be decidedly in the negative.

Social Evolution cannot be forced in a false direction, no matter how favorable the conditions or how great the power behind the effort. Particularly is it impossible to force Social Evolution to operate on the principles of surgery. Socialists are given to prating about "removing the cause." Social systems cannot be removed surgically—by cutting out with a knife. Social Evolution alone possesses the power to cure social ills. Just as a physician must study physiology and pathology in order to understand nature's method of dealing with disease, and thus be in a position to intelligently co-operate with nature in an effort to bring about a cure—which can

be brought about only by nature herself—so must the scientific Socialist study Social Evolution, comprehend the laws that underlie its operations in order that he may intelligently assist in the process. More than that he cannot do. To believe that he can himself force a cure by “removing the cause” is to put himself entirely outside of the pale of science.

While revolutions cannot be made to order, they nevertheless can be explained. Past revolutions were uprisings of the populace against the Government. There is an explanation for this. Marx and Kautsky tell us that the next revolution will take the form of a civil war; one portion of the people against another rather than against the authorities. They offer an explanation for this prediction. This explanation has the class struggle for its basis. No conclusion other than civil war is admissible upon such a premise.

We have proven this premise to be absolutely false. The claim that the class struggle has been the historic basis of social progress we now know to be false and Utopian. The class struggle has been a phenomenon of every historic epoch since primitive communism, but Social Evolution did not evolve in response to this struggle. The propelling motive power behind all social change has been the basic economic problem, the solution to the problem of existence. Man evolved in response to his interests as a consumer, not as a producer. Society evolved in response to the interests of the majority, as consumers, as social beings, not as producers. Social

production evolved as the most efficient method of solving the problem common to all in society as consumers, not as producers. And social ownership of these means of production must ultimately be brought about by way of the common interest of the majority in society organized as consumers, not as producers.

The civil war antisocial theory is false because its premise is false. It does not possess a single element of scientific justification. It has no precedent in history and the striking manifestations of modern Social Evolution stamp such a prediction as irresponsible and ludicrous prattle.

Marx's disciples have in practice thoroughly repudiated this theory. Parliamentary activity is essentially social in its nature. Parliamentary activity was adopted empirically, in opposition to the dictates of their principles. It is for this reason that revolutionary, scientific Marxians are opposed to parliamentary activity. It is the rock which has split the International Socialist movement into hopelessly impotent factional groups. Lenine and Trotsky, the Spartacists, and all Left Wing factions demand uncompromising adherence to Marxian anti-social principles. They demand proletarian procedure and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are opposed to parliamentarism.

CHAPTER XI

WHOM DOES CAPITALISM EXPLOIT?

WHAT is the net result of the class struggle since Marx's time? Has labor succeeded in obtaining a larger proportion of what it produces or has capital increased its share of labor's products? How is the answer to be determined?

The Marxian will tell us that the answer is easily obtained. The purchasing power of wages is the infallible barometer. At this writing (April, 1919) the purchasing power of wages is probably lower than at any time in the past half century. Does this mean that modern producers are worse off than were the producers of fifty years ago?

A gain in wages if not offset by an increase in living cost is a real gain. But most wage gains are offset by advances in the cost of necessities; therefore, the amount of Surplus Value extracted from the workers would not be reduced. But suppose the cost of living remained fixed and the workers of a given industry were to succeed in reducing, say by 50 per cent., the amount of Surplus Value extracted from them, would this meet with Socialist approval? Assuming that the workers could succeed in reducing the Surplus Value still more, say by 95 per cent.,

would not the Socialists be delighted? And, finally, if the workers were to succeed in driving the capitalist owners out entirely and were themselves to take over the means of production, would the Socialists exclaim in glee that the class struggle is over, for the workers are now obtaining the full product of their toil at least in one industry. Would there arise any question among Socialists whether they ought to support the workers in their efforts to obtain that last 5 per cent? What could be the ground for an objection? In what way could the Socialists convince the workers who were now in a position to obtain "the full product of their toil" that they ought to turn the ownership over to the whole people?

"You taught us that all profit comes from labor. We did away with profit in our industry; what can we gain by turning the industry over to the people; where is the injustice if we keep it ourselves? We do not exploit anyone." How would this argument be met in the light of all Socialist teaching?

The Socialists have never offered a rational reply to this form of argument. Such argument is valid in the light of present-day Socialist teachings. When Socialists who show such a readiness to *follow* Marx will betray a like willingness to *study* Marx, the answer will soon become apparent.

The class struggle in capitalist society arises from the fact that capital extracts Surplus Value at the point of production. Who created the values and from whom does capital extract Surplus Value and

to whom does Socialism aim to restore the Surplus Value which, under the present system, is appropriated by capital?

What is meant by "social tools, social means of production"? Do we mean a modern factory with its division of labor, each contributing a part towards the finished product that is the output of that factory? Have the workers of that factory the right to claim the finished product as their sole property? Did Marx's study of the nature of capitalist production justify this conclusion?

Let us see what Marx has to say on this vital point:

Capital is a collective product, only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort only *by the united action of all members of society can it be set in motion*. Capital is therefore not a personal, *it is a social power*. When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, *into the property of all members of society*, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. *It loses its class character.*¹

In the above quotation, Marx makes it perfectly clear that in modern society it is not alone the immediate workers of a given industry that contribute toward the creation of social values, but every useful member of society, directly or indirectly, contributes something toward the creation of these values.

Let us take a single industry, as an illustration of this important fact, a fact which the Socialist parties of the world have completely ignored.

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 35. (My italics).

The Ford automobile will serve our purpose admirably.

Henry Ford and his comparatively few associates extract annually millions of dollars in Surplus Value in the process of the manufacture and sale of the Ford car. To whom does that Surplus Value belong? Is it the sole product of the vast army of workers immediately involved in the manufacture of the Ford? Think of the materials contained in the Ford car. We have to go back to the mines. We have to go back to the chemists who made possible the extraction of the ore; think of the tools and machinery without which mining would be impossible. Think of the millions who directly or indirectly contributed towards the creation of that mining machinery. Think of the transportation, from the inventors of steam and electricity to the man who drives the spikes into the beam that holds the rail. Think of this beam that came from the forest; try to enumerate the countless steps in the process before it could be used as a rail support. Think of the road-building, without which automobiles would be useless, and think of the thousands of other factors that have contributed to the creation of the value that is represented in the Ford car, and then ask yourself the question, to whom does the Surplus Value extracted by Ford and his associates belong? How is it possible for a worker to determine the full value of his labor and so be able to tell when he is obtaining the "full product of his toil"? Neither Marx nor Engels ever undertook to answer that question for

the individual worker or any group of workers. On the contrary, Engels¹ admits, that there are difficulties with the popular claim of the worker to the full proceeds of his labor.

It would be difficult to determine what amount would constitute the "full product of his toil" for any laborer, because the part an individual plays in modern production is absorbed in the intricacies of social production, and here by social production is meant not simply subdivision of labor in a given industry, but division of labor in society as a whole. The wealth created annually is the product of all useful members of society.

Marx treated his subject from the standpoint of a single capitalist and single worker, not with the aim of pointing out to the individual worker how to obtain the "full product of his toil," but for the purpose of simplifying and making more graphic the complicated mechanism involved in the process of exploitation under the capitalist system.

The individual worker could not obtain the full product of his toil from the individual capitalist for the simple reason that the individual capitalist does not himself realize the full value of labor's product. Marx pointed out very clearly that the capitalist does not sell commodities at their value, but at their price of production plus the average profit rate.

If the individual capitalist does not obtain full value for his commodities, he obviously could not

¹ Herr Eugen Dubrig's *Unwatzung*, quoted by Bernstein, p. 28, *Evolutionary Socialism*.

give the laborer the full value of his product, even if he so desired.

Are we to conclude then that it will be impossible to determine the point at which it can be said that exploitation has ceased? The point is easily determined, if we keep constantly before us the important fact that production is a social process, that every useful member of society has contributed toward the creation of the national wealth. Marx made it very clear that there is but one scientific way of gauging capitalist exploitation and that is by ascertaining the proportion that capitalist exploitation bears to the value of the total production of society and not to the value of the product of an individual laborer or group of laborers. The capitalist class exploits society as a whole; it appropriates *social Surplus Value*. Marx strongly emphasized this vital fact and used it with great force in every controversy.

Now, if it is society that is the creator of all social wealth, if it is society that is compelled to yield up Surplus Value to the capitalist class, instead of a class struggle, what in reality is taking place is a *social struggle*—the struggle of society against a class, the profit-making class. Marxian economics admit of no other conclusion. To uphold the anti-social class struggle theory in the face of these facts is to effectively repudiate Marx.

If Marx recognized that the wealth annually created is the product of social effort, created through the aid of every useful member in society, why didn't

he base his demand for Socialism on social lines? Why did he appeal to but one class, the proletariat? Why did he call for revolutionary action on the part of the proletariat?

Marx believed that in the class struggle he had discovered the historic law of Social Evolution. He disclosed the genesis of the class struggle in capitalist society, showing that it arises out of the fact that Surplus Value is extracted at the point of production. To Marx,¹ it appeared that society as a whole is split into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. He expected that the proletariat would soon constitute the "immense majority." What meaning did the term "proletariat" convey to Marx? Was it limited to the manual workers directly engaged in factory production? No one would prove so bold as to support this contention. Marx, as we have seen, fully recognized the social character of wealth production, and directed his appeal to the producers because of his conception of the historic law of Social Evolution.

Social progress, thought Marx, always operates through the class struggle and, since the majority had common interests primarily as producers, to appeal to the producers was to him the logical, historical and therefore scientific procedure.

So long as the capitalist system lasts, thought Marx, exploitation at the point of production not only must continue, but must increase; therefore, a revolution is the only method by which to abolish

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 13.

exploitation. It was not expected that this would prove a difficult task in view of the fact that the capitalist mode of production appeared in imminent danger of collapse.

Marx's predictions were not fulfilled because the premise upon which they are based is false. Modern social history has brought to light the fact that Marx had no conception of the true laws of Social Evolution operating throughout history and in modern society.

Present-day Marxians, instead of observing the lessons of history, adhere dogmatically to Marx's conclusions, or, what is worse, to their own narrow garbled and perverted interpretation of his conclusions. Hence, in their agitation they completely ignore the social character of modern production; they appeal primarily to the industrial proletariat, the worker in direct contact with the industrial processes.

For them this is the only safe procedure, since it does not call for the expenditure of any brain power. Considered from the standpoint of the individual wage worker or group of workers, the class struggle, they believe, holds good. Therefore, modern "Marxists" are "scientific" when they preach the class struggle and ignore the social struggle.

This class appeal, this demand for the dictatorship of the proletariat, can find no justification in Marxian economics or in the laws of Social Evolution. It is both Utopian and thoroughly anti-social.

If conflict is to be considered the motive power of

Social Evolution, then not one, but three distinct conflicts must be studied and interpreted. Such a study would soon disclose that of the three, the class struggle as the "Marxists" understand it has the least historic significance or social justification. The two struggles that the "Marxists" so completely ignore—the social struggle against a class and the active conflict raging between the several factions of the exploiting class—these reflect a real historic purpose and are fraught with far-reaching social significance.

But not even these historic struggles affect the operations of Social Evolution. They are but incidents arising from the operations of the true laws of Social Evolution.

A detailed study of modern Social Evolution furnishes convincing evidence of the soundness of this conclusion.

CHAPTER XII

EXPROPRIATING THE EXPROPRIATORS

MARXISTS look for Socialism to be the outcome of the collapse of capitalism and the triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But this theory is never brought to the front in normal times. Only under abnormal conditions of a character similar to those through which we are now passing is this theory very carefully removed from its camphor-sprinkled container and exposed to the light.

The Marxists seem to be conscious that in normal times this theory would jar and be hopelessly out of tune with the normal social processes. Therefore, for normal conditions, they have an entirely different theory. Socialism will be the outgrowth of industrial development. As an industry develops into a gigantic trust it will be ripe for socialization. They point to the steel trust, the harvester trust, the oil trust in illustration of their views. The growth and development of these gigantic industrial institutions is an outstanding fact. But where is the process of socialization? Where is there to be noted even as much as a tendency in this direction? The industrial giants appear quite safe from social molestation. The Marxists have guessed wrong.

We have seen that all recent social progress instead of weakening industrial capital has tended actually to strengthen it. Never in its history has industrial capital extracted a larger rate of Surplus Value than it does to-day.

The question arises, if social progress strengthens industrial capital, what is the hope of abolishing capitalism except through a proletarian revolution?

We have laid down as a universal historic proposition that the impelling motive power behind all social change is the quest for a solution to the problem of existence. New social systems appear as the gradual outgrowth of the old, not as the result of conflict between exploiters and exploited, but through harmony of interest of the majority as social beings; this majority is obtained through a combination of the powerful and the useful as against the remnant of the past and useless of the present.

This formula constitutes a complete inversion of the Marxian theory in that it assumes that social progress is attained through harmony of interest of the exploiters and exploited.

What in this respect are the lessons to be drawn from the social processes operating within capitalist society? Are there any indications of a conflict of interest in the camp of the exploiters? If there are, what is its historic or social significance? Where in capitalist society is there to be noted specific instances of social progress attained through harmony of interest of exploiters and exploited?

Marx has made clear that the wealth annually

created by a modern nation is the product of the combined efforts of every useful member of that nation. If society owned and controlled the social means of wealth production, the created wealth would belong to society. But society does not own these social tools. Their ownership is vested in private hands. These owners withhold from society a very large proportion of the socially created products. But in order to realize the values contained within these products they must first be sold. A great many factors enter into this process, all of which bear upon the proportion of Surplus Value, falling to the share of the producing capitalist.

As Karl Kautsky says:

The surplus which the capitalist class appropriates is larger than is usually imagined. It covers not only the profits of the manufacturer, but many other items that are usually credited to the cost of production and exchange. It covers, for instance, rents, interest on loans, salaries, merchants' profits, taxes, etc. All these have to be subtracted from the surplus, *i.e.*, the excess of the value of the product over the wages of the workingmen.¹ . . . The surplus produced by the proletariat becomes more and more the only source from which the whole capitalist class draws its income.² . . . However distasteful it may be to him, the capitalist is compelled to "divide" with the landowner and the State. And the share claimed by each of these increases from year to year.³

It appears that the original robbers are not permitted to enjoy their "swag" in peace. They are compelled to share it with innumerable groups of

¹ *Class Struggle*, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

their own class. Marx divided the Surplus Value into three main divisions: rent, interest and profit.

Referring to this subject, Hillquit says:

The three main forms of capitalist revenue, rent, interest and profits, spring as we have seen from the same source, the "surplus value" of the producing capitalists; and the shares of these three categories of income stand in inverse relation to each other. It is, of course, conceivable that rent, interest and profits may rise simultaneously at the expense of the working class and the consumer, but they need not and do not always increase in equal proportions, and the total quantity of surplus value remaining equal an increase of rents or a rise of the rate of interest will signify a lowering of the profits, and vice versa. The three main economic divisions of capitalists dependent on the three forms of income mentioned, the rent-gathering landowner, the interest-drawing money lender and the profit-making manufacturer and merchant are thus by no means united in interest between themselves. The money lender or banker exploits the mortgaged landowner and the borrowing industrial alike, while the owner of the factory site and store property exploits the manufacturer and merchant with equal thoroughness. Nor is the industrial group of the capitalist class always a unit in interests; the interests of the manufacturer usually run counter to those of the sellers, and vice versa; and even within the manufacturing class the interests of separate trades are frequently opposed to each other.¹

No sooner is the victim robbed of his belongings than the thieves set to quarreling among themselves over the division of the booty. The question arises, is this quarrel between the thieves of any interest to the victim? There seems to be considerable difference of opinion among Socialists as to this. Says John Spargo:

¹ *Socialism Theory and Practice*, pp. 158-159.

But how the Surplus Value is divided among landlords, money lenders, creditors, speculators and actual employers is a matter of absolutely no moment to the workers as a class. . . . The division of the Surplus Value wrung from the toil of the workers gives rise to much quarrel and strife within the ranks of the exploiting class, but the working class recognizes and vaguely and instinctively feels where it does not clearly recognize that it has no interest in these quarrels. All that interests it vitally is how to lessen the extent of the exploitation to which it is subjected and how ultimately to end that exploitation altogether. That is the objective of the movement for the socialization of the means of life.¹ [My italics.]

So the working class is not interested in the quarrel between the capitalists, but is vitally interested in lessening the extent of exploitation to which it is subjected. But how is its exploitation to be lessened? Evidently at the point of production, where all exploitation takes place.

Thus does Spargo join Hillquit in the view that Socialism does not concern itself with consumable wealth, but only with productive capital. After relieving themselves of this common viewpoint one can see Hillquit and Spargo, arm and arm, entering the committee room to prepare "immediate demands" planks, most of which haven't the remotest bearing upon exploitation at the point of production, but nevertheless are offered to the working class on the ground that they are "calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression." With this

¹ *Socialism*, pp. 268-269.

task finished, Hillquit and Spargo no doubt turned to the more important work of drawing up the main platform based upon the scientific assertion that *reforming of capitalism is not only useless, it is criminal.*

Such are the views and actions of the leading American Socialists. But neither Marx nor his immediate disciples are responsible for them. On the contrary, they held opinions in direct opposition to these views. Thus we read:

It [the working class] compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers by *taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself.* Thus the ten-hour bill in England was carried. Altogether, *collisions between the classes of the old society further in many ways the course of development of the proletariat.* The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy, *later on with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry.*¹ [My italics.]

In this quarrel between the exploiters Marx saw great possibilities for the exploited.

Says Kautsky:

“It was not for nothing that Marx and Engels fought the use of the phrase, ‘reactionary mass,’ because it tended to conceal the antagonism that exists between different factions of the ruling class, *which may well be very important in securing the progress of the working class.*² (My italics.) But modern “Marxists,” despite the lessons of recent social evolution, are not interested in those antagon-

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 27.

² *Road to Power*, p. 11.

isms. The only antagonism which concerns them is the antagonism which does not concern social evolution. And this is the scientific movement that claims to be based upon the science and laws of social evolution!

It becomes necessary that we make a study of modern Social Evolution and observe, if possible, to what degree it has been influenced by conflict of interests in the ranks of the exploiters and harmony of interest between exploiters and exploited.

Although the operations of Social Evolution in capitalist society are bewildering in their complexity, it is yet possible to discern that they are working out in four well-defined forms: (1) *Social and industrial reforms*; (2) *public ownership of the means of transportation and communication*; (3) *direct taxation*; (4) *governmental activity in the distribution of consumable wealth*.

Marx and Engels looked to England because of her advanced industrial development to be the first nation to be won over to Socialism. Later on it became the fashion among Socialists to point a prophetic finger to the United States. Time proved both to be mere guesses. The first social tendencies manifested themselves not in industrially developed countries, but in industrially *backward* countries like Germany, Australia, New Zealand. Why? These social activities concerned themselves with practically every social question except the means of production and exploitation at the point of production. Why? Here is the answer:

The advanced stage of the capitalist mode of production, distribution and exchange in England and the United States meant for the *entire* people of those countries a far greater advance in the direction of a solution to the problem of existence than had been attained by any other nation. As an inevitable corollary of this social progress the rate of exploitation at the point of production in England and the United States was beyond anything ever known.

In Germany feudalism lingered. It could not so easily be shaken off, because Germany possessed every element favorable to its retention. Slowly but surely, however, feudalism, even in Germany, was compelled to yield because it lacked the one element possessed by bourgeois society—greater security in the means of life.

The feudal form of society left Germany far behind the capitalist nations in the rate of progress towards a solution to the problem of existence. The capitalist system of society marked a tremendous forward step in the direction towards a solution to the basic problem of life—the elimination of uncertainty in the means of existence.

The capitalist mode of production gradually took root in Germany. Its advantages over the feudal mode of production soon became apparent and made itself felt in greater abundance for all within the nation. At about 1870, Germany turned its back upon the past and gave itself over unreservedly to the future. How to develop the new mode of pro-

duction to the highest possible degree became the national problem. What did the thought of the highest possible degree evoke in the German mind? Why, none other than the standards set by England and the United States. These two countries were creating wealth upon an unprecedented scale. Was it possible for Germany to duplicate their successes? This problem offered many difficulties. In the first place, the other countries had the best of the start by a good many years. Then there were the geographical limitations as well as the great handicap of poverty in certain indispensable natural resources.

What were the chances of overcoming these well-nigh insuperable handicaps? They appeared slim indeed. Private initiative created the stupendous wealth of the other capitalist nations. Could private initiative prove equal to the task of overcoming the handicaps under which the German nation labored? An attempt soon proved the futility of the hope. There was but one way left open by which to meet the efficiency of the other capitalist countries, and that was by *greater efficiency*. And this greater efficiency the Government alone was capable of supplying. Thanks to the more advanced capitalist countries, efficient machinery of production was readily obtainable. German private capital was equal to the task of installing the most efficient means of production that the genius of the more advanced nations had succeeded in developing.

The rate of exploitation at the point of production increased in proportion, but the social welfare had

been advanced inasmuch as marked progress had been made in the direction of a solution to the problem of existence.

But the standards of England and the United States had not as yet been reached. Germany was still far behind in total accumulated wealth. There was only one way of overtaking the leaders and that was by greater efficiency in production. Wealth production must be multiplied and intensified. The best brains within the German nation concentrated their attention upon a study of this vital problem. From the mass of data gathered on the subject, the conclusive lesson was drawn that the physical and mental condition of a worker profoundly influenced his powers of production. It was found that the physically and mentally backward worker could not compete against the productive powers of a worker who was developed physically and mentally.

This fact once established, there arose the practical problem of how to raise the productive efficiency of the great mass of workers through a general rise in the level of physical and mental development.

Better and more prolonged childhood training was agitated. Better working conditions for factory employees, a shorter work day, health protection and disease prevention; in short, all measures calculated to improve the physical and mental development of the masses were proposed with the specific purpose of raising the productive powers of the German nation. To employers conclusive evidence was furnished which purported to prove that greatly

increased profits would flow from the improved factory and working conditions. Nevertheless, the proposed reforms were not universally adopted by factory owners. Those who were willing to install the new conditions feared that, should the optimistic promises of increased profits fail to materialize, they would be ruined through inability to compete with their less scrupulous competitors.

How was this situation to be met? Should the shortsightedness of a group be permitted to operate against the social interests of the German nation? Was the German nation to be prevented from taking this great stride forward in the direction towards a solution to the problem of existence by failing to take advantage of the newly discovered means of multiplying its wealth-creating powers? This would be against public policy and therefore could not be permitted. The new method of increasing wealth production must be made compulsory through the powers of the State.

Social and industrial reforms were initiated as a means of securing to the German nation the increased productivity which is the consequence of a physically and mentally developed working class. Reforms once initiated were never rescinded. The benefits to which they gave rise were so obvious, that there was no question of rescinding, but rather one of constant expansion.

The concrete results flowing from the practical operations of these reforms were as follows: (1) *A long step forward in the direction towards a solution*

to the problem of existence because of greatly stimulated wealth production; (2) an increased rate of exploitation at the point of production as an inevitable corollary of an increased rate of wealth production; (3) a marked improvement in the social status of the masses and the great benefits flowing from the physical and intellectual development made possible by social and industrial reforms; (4) the elimination of the capitalist principle—profit—and the substitution of the Socialist principle—service—in the supplying of the several needs undertaken by the State, such as education, health protection, etc., etc. Thus the interests of the powerful and useful operated against the element that rendered those services for profit.

With the increased production that resulted from the greater efficiency of the German masses, the problem of transportation and communication came to the front. Productive capital required efficient transportation and communication. There must be no interruption in the flow of raw materials to the factories and in the transportation of the finished product to the market. Production had been rendered efficient by thorough systematizing and elimination of waste.

The cost of circulation of commodities is a charge on production. The time consumed in circulation has a direct bearing on the turnover and therefore on the profits of productive capital. Productive capital is as interested in efficiency in transportation as it is in efficiency in production.

Private capital failed to bring the railroads up to

the same standard of efficiency that private capital accomplished in production. This inefficiency in transportation acted as a fetter on production and in large measure negatived the benefits accruing from the increased efficiency shown by the physically and mentally bettered working class.

This situation was inimical to social interests. The German State, in the interest of social progress, was compelled to take over the railroads and thus bring them up to the same high plane of efficiency attained by productive capital.

Here we have one more instance of the interests of productive capital coinciding with the social interests of the majority, both operating against the group who obtain profits through their private ownership of the means of transportation. The proved inefficiency of private ownership compelled its elimination. The profit principle in the means of transportation was thus eliminated in the German nation and replaced by the social principle based upon efficient service.

The third outstanding form taken by modern Social Evolution is that of direct taxation.

The economic and social functions undertaken by a State require capital. Society cannot assume an economic function without being in a position to finance it. How does society obtain the necessary funds? Direct taxation as a phenomenon of modern Social Evolution has proved a most effective means of financing all social endeavors. To the capitalist class accrue the bulk of the benefits of the increased

productivity of a physically and mentally developed working class. The capitalist class must therefore stand the cost entailed in the process of improving the efficiency of the human machine. This is accomplished through the principle of direct taxation.

The most important fact to be noted in connection with collectivist taxation is that it forms an essential, indispensable part of the whole scheme of collectivist efforts on behalf of the individual. . . . Public health, education and recreation, public housing and food supply, may all be considered from the economic standpoint as sound investments which *in the end* will produce a profit to the nation and to all classes of the nation, including capitalists and property owners. But the financial returns on such "investments" are very indirect, slow and even uncertain, from the point of view of those economic classes whose profits from such Government expenditures is most indirect. It is therefore necessary to consider most Government outlay for such purposes rather as "Communistic" expenditures for the welfare of the masses than as economic investments. Therefore, the money to support these Government activities must be secured rather through taxation than through loans. Undoubtedly, governmental housing and governmental control of the food supply in their present stage of development should be considered rather as merely Socialistic than as Communistic enterprises. For at the present time such activities are made to pay their way. At any rate, public activities in regard to health, education, recreation and the development of science and art are not expected to "pay" from a purely financial standpoint, but only from the point of view of the economic profit they should bring to the nation as a whole after the lapse of a considerable period of time.

A large part of the proceeds of the graduated direct taxation [chiefly income and inheritance taxes] of recent years has been used for the *social or collectivist purpose of raising the economic level of industrial efficiency of that part of the population which has*

been most in need of such assistance. Such taxation had reached a very high level in many countries; for example, Great Britain, Germany and Australia before the war.

The "taxation of the rich for the benefit of the poor" had so well demonstrated its practicability and value to the nation by May, 1914, that even the *London Times* indorsed the radical extension of the principle in the new budget. The *London Nation* remarked that *this method of improving the national efficiency through raising the earning power and the physical and intellectual forces of the nation* was by that time approved by all political parties.¹

Until but a few years ago the indirect form of taxation was the principal source of all Government revenue. The two favorite forms of indirect taxation were customs and internal duties. Both are borne chiefly by the masses, as they are a levy upon articles of consumption. The capitalist class not only retained all the Surplus Value extracted from society, but unloaded all expenses of the Government upon society to be met out of the portion of the wealth falling to society.

As long as this condition prevailed society could do nothing towards improving the condition of its members. Society could not pull itself up by its own boot straps. Then came the change. Direct taxation of income and inheritance was adopted.

The House of Representatives, in its report² states that Great Britain before the European war, during her fiscal year ending March 31, 1914, collected from

¹ From chapter on "Taxation of Capital and Industry for Social Purposes," *State Socialism, Pro and Con*, by Walling and Laidler. (My italics.)

² *Congressional Record*, 1916, p. 922.

income taxes \$230,000,000 and from inheritance taxes \$132,000,000. Great Britain's total revenue was \$620,000,000, and of this amount, taxes from income and inheritance yielded \$362,000,000, or 58 per cent of the total. In other words, Great Britain in times of peace collected 58 per cent of her revenue from the taxation of incomes and inheritances. This 58 per cent of governmental expense under the old form of taxation would have been paid mainly out of the wages of the working class. The income tax saved this huge sum for the masses and took it from the Surplus Value extracted by the capitalist class.

Since the war the sums raised by Great Britain through the income tax have increased by over 300 per cent.

Germany made very heavy demands on the incomes of the capitalist class. But it is not to the Reichstag with its strong Socialist representation that this was principally due. On the contrary, it was in the states and cities where the Socialists were practically powerless that the heaviest income levies were made. In the larger cities the income tax was usually *added* to the State tax and very often it was twice as great. The cities of northern Germany raised from 50 to 77 per cent of their revenue through the income tax, while the German states have been raising from 60 to 80 per cent of their taxes in this way and the proportion has been constantly increasing.

Here in the United States the income-tax principle has been slow to take hold, in spite of our

democracy. The rate adopted in 1914 when the law was first passed has since been greatly increased. It is reported that for 1917 the capitalist class had to return \$300,000,000 to the national treasury. For 1918 the Carnegies, the Rockefellers and the Morgans returned \$650,000 out of every \$1,000,000 they pilfered from the people. The Steel Trust was compelled to give up in gold part of its 1918 "steal" to the tune of \$233,465,000. The estimated yield from the income tax for 1918 is figured at \$4,000,-000,000.

All this has hardly raised a ripple in Socialist circles. Had the steel workers gone out on strike and lost millions of dollars in wages in an effort to obtain a 5 or 10 per cent raise, their success in wresting back that much Surplus Value would have delighted every Socialist in the country, but were the workers to succeed in obtaining hold of the steel trust and thus secure for themselves "the full product of their toil," it would be the occasion for another storm within the party. Such is the science upon which Socialists base their activities.

If the Socialities are indifferent to these millions upon millions returned by the capitalists of the country as part of the Surplus Value extracted from the people, the capitalist class is not. It will be very happy to capitalize this indifference to obtain a very radical reduction in the tax rate once the war emergency is removed.

While the income-tax principle has come to stay, the *extent* to which it will be applied depends upon a

variety of circumstances not the least of which is an intelligent comprehension of its historic significance.

We have now reviewed three outstanding forms assumed by modern Social Evolution and have observed how they all operate in response to a common purpose, to multiply production and thus advance in the direction towards a solution to the problem of existence.

Social and industrial reforms improved the efficiency of the human machine and thus made it more productive. Social ownership of the means of transportation and communication was made necessary because production was hampered by inefficiency in these departments. Direct taxation made possible the carrying out of the above improvements. We have now to consider the fourth phenomenon of modern Social Evolution—social concern in the distribution of consumable wealth.

Distribution of consumable wealth is the aim and end of all social change; the effort to solve the basic problem of security in the means of life. All social changes which seek to multiply production are not an end in themselves, but a means to an end. They are set in motion in response to the problem of distribution. All history is but a record of man's strivings for a solution to this problem. The capitalist mode of production was evolved in response to this problem. Social Evolution is operating to obtain for society the maximum distribution of the wealth the capitalist mode of production is capable of creating. Inefficiency in production reacts on dis-

tribution; inefficiency in distribution reacts on production. Therefore, social concern in distribution springs from a double motive: (1) maximum efficiency in the distribution of the socially created wealth; (2) the stimulation of efficiency in production through efficiency in distribution.

How does this social concern in the distribution of consumable wealth react on the interests of the capitalist class? The study we have thus far made of the phenomena of modern social evolution shows them to be operating in harmony with the interests of the owners of the means of production. Is this latest phenomenon of modern Social Evolution—social concern in distribution—inimical to the interests of the capitalist owners of the means of production? It would require no little courage to answer this question in the affirmative. The owners of the means of production live off profit. Profit or Surplus Value though obtained at the point of production must be realized at the point of consumption. There can be no profits unless products are sold. Certainty of sale makes for certainty of production and therefore not only for profits, but for multiplied profits through multiplied production. Social assumption of the function of distribution makes for efficiency in distribution and therefore operates in harmony with the interests of the owners of the means of production.

The capitalist mode of distribution or exchange based upon the profit principle is inefficient and therefore detrimental both to the interests of the

owners of the means of production and the vast majority in society as consumers.

The group of capitalists functioning in the sphere of circulation who obtain their profits through the purchase and sale of commodities have proved inefficient and thus a fetter to social progress. Social Evolution in response to the harmony of interests of the powerful and useful is operating to eliminate the useless middleman, speculator, merchant, trader, etc. Social Evolution has nothing in store for this group of parasites except oblivion. They hamper the full development of the capitalist mode of production and therefore are inimical to social progress.

But all this has little social significance to Marxists. As Hillquit puts it: *Socialism is not concerned with consumable wealth, but only with productive capital.* Why, because Marx devoted a very considerable portion of the third volume of *Das Kapital* in an effort to prove that the merchant is indispensable to the capitalist mode of production and therefore cannot be eliminated except through the complete abolition of the capitalist system of society.

Marx's analysis of the merchant as an indispensable factor in the capitalist mode of production is so important to our study that we deem it necessary to quote him extensively upon this subject.

The total capital of society [says Marx] exists always in part in commodities on the market about to be converted into money, and this part is naturally made up of ever-changing elements and is continually changing in quantity. Another part exists

as money on the market, ready to be converted into commodities. These portions of the total capital are perpetually passing through these metamorphoses. To the extent that this function of capital in the process of circulation becomes a special function of *independent* capital and becomes an established service assigned by division of labor to some particular species of capitalists, the commodity capital becomes commercial or financial capital...

The dealer in commodities, as a capitalist, appears first on the market as the representative of a certain sum of money, which he advances in his capacity as a capitalist. He desires to transform this sum of money from its original value x into $x +$ and x , that is, the original sum plus his profit. But it is evident that his capital must first enter the market in the shape of money, not only on account of his capacity as a capitalist in general, but also as a trader in commodities in particular. For he does not produce any commodities. He merely trades in them; he acts as a middleman in their movements, and in order to be able to trade in them, he must first buy them, must be the owner of money—capital. . . . The function of selling . . . has been transferred from the manufacturer to the merchant, has been converted into the *particular* business of the merchant, while it used to be a function which the producer had to perform after completing the process of its production. . . . The difference is only that this incidental function of the producer is now established as the *exclusive business of a special kind of capitalists, of merchants, and becomes the independent business of a special investment of capital*. . . . It is evident then that commodity-capital assumes in commercial capital the form of an independent class of capital through the fact that the merchant advances money-capital. This money-capital serves its purpose as capital only by attending exclusively to the conversion of commodity-capital into money-capital, and it accomplishes this by the continual purchase and sale of commodities. . . .

Merchants' capital is simply capital performing its functions in the sphere of circulation. The process of circulation is a phase

of the total process of reproduction. But no value is produced in the process of circulation, and, therefore, no Surplus Value. Nothing takes place there but changes of form of the same mass of values. In fact, nothing occurs there but the metamorphosis of commodities and this has nothing to do either with the creation or with the transformation of values. *If Surplus Value is realized by the sale of the produced commodities, it is only because that Surplus Value already existed in them. . . .* Before the commodities bought by the industrial capitalist are taken back to market as salable commodities, they pass through the process of production, in which that portion of their price which shall be realized as profit must be created. But it is different with the trading merchant. The commodities are in his hands only so long as they are in the process of circulation. He merely continues their sale, the realization of their price begun by the productive capitalist and therefore he does not cause them to pass through any intermediate process, in which they can once more absorb new Surplus Value. . . . How does the merchants' capital manage to appropriate its share of the Surplus Value or profit produced by the productive capital? Just as the industrial capital makes profits by selling labor embodied and realized in commodities for which it has not paid any equivalent, so the merchants' capital makes profits by not paying the productive capital for all the unpaid labor incorporated in the commodities . . . while in selling it demands payment for this unpaid portion still contained in the commodities and not paid for by itself. The relation of the merchants' capital to the Surplus Value is different from that of the industrial capital. The industrial capital produces Surplus Value by the *direct* appropriation of the unpaid labor of others. *The merchants' capital, on the other hand, appropriates a portion of this surplus value by having this portion transferred from the industrial capital to itself. . . .*

Let us suppose that the total industrial capital advanced for one year is 720C plus 180v equals 900 (say million p. st.) and that s' equals 100%. The product is then valued at 720c plus 180v plus 180 s. Now let us call this product the produced com-

modity-capital, C. Its value or its price of production (both are identical for the total social commodity-capital) is then 1080 and the rate of profit for the total social capital of 900 is 20%. These 20% constitute, according to our previous analysis, the average rate of profit, since the Surplus Value is not calculated in this instance on this or that capital of some particular composition, but on the average composition of the total industrial capital. In short, C equals 1080, and the rate of profit equals 20%. Now let us further assume that aside from these 900 of industrial capital there are invested 100 of merchants' capital which share in the profit just as the industrial capital does, in proportion to their magnitude. According to our assumption, the total capital consists of 900 industrial plus 100 commercial equal 1000, so that the commercial capital is 1/10 of the whole. Therefore it participates to the extent of 1/10 in the total Surplus Value of 180 and by this means secures a profit at the rate of 18%. Actually, then, the profit remaining to be distributed among the other 9/10 of the total capital is only 162, which amounts likewise to 18% on the total capital of 900. In other words, the price at which C is sold by the owners of the industrial capital of 900 to the dealers is 720c plus 180v plus 162s equal 1062. Now, if the dealer adds his average profit of 18% on his capital of 100, he sells the commodities at 1062 plus 18 equals 1080, which is their price of production, or from the point of view of the total commodity-capital their value, although he makes his profit only in and by the circulation and only by an excess of his selling price over his purchase price. But nevertheless he does not sell the commodities above their value nor above their price of production just because he had bought them from the industrial capitalist below their value or below their price of production.

The merchants' capital, then, plays a determining role in the formation of the average rate of profit in proportion to its pro rata magnitude of the total capital. Hence, if we say that the average rate of profit is 18% it would be 20%, were it not for

the fact that 1/10 of the total capital is merchants' capital, which implies a reduction of the rate of profit 1/10.¹

The above rather lengthy summary proves how clear was Marx's understanding of the "dividing up" process going on within the capitalist class. The original exploiters of Surplus Value—the producing capitalists—must constantly yield up a part of their profit. Every trader, be he wholesaler, broker, speculator, retailer or merchant of any sort—each and all of these obtain their profits by taking from the exploiter a part of his original stealings. The amount falling to the merchant is directly dependent upon the magnitude of his investment. The participation of his capital means a falling off in the rate of profit for the producing capitalists.

Would it be correct then to assume that there is a clash of interests between producing capital and trading capital? It is difficult to see how one can escape this conclusion. But strange as it may seem, such was not Marx's conclusion. His analysis of merchants' capital and merchants' profits not only failed to support this conclusion, but, on the contrary, aimed to upset it. For he says later on that:

Commercial capital is nothing but the commodity-capital of the producer, which has to pass through its transformation into money and to perform its function of commodity-capital on the market. The operations of the merchant are really nothing but operations which must be performed under all circumstances in order to convert the commodity-capital of the producer into

¹ *Das Kapital*, vol. iii.

money-capital, operations which promote the function of the commodity-capital in the process of circulation and reproduction. If a clerk of the producer were to attend exclusively to the sale and also with the purchase instead of an independent merchant, this connection would not be obscured for a moment. . . . If the merchants' capital does not exceed its necessary proportions it may be assumed (1) that as a result of division of labor the capital devoted exclusively to buying and selling (and this includes not only the money required for the purchase of commodities, but also the money which must be invested in the labor required for running the business of the merchant in the constant capital of the merchant, storerooms, transportation, etc.) is smaller than it would be if the industrial capitalist had to carry on the entire commercial part of the business himself; (2) that the exclusive occupation of the merchant with this business enables the producer to convert his commodities more rapidly into money, and permits the commodity-capital itself to pass more quickly through its metamorphosis than it would in the hands of the producer; that looking upon the entire merchants' capital in proportion to the industrial capital, one turnover of the merchants' capital may represent not only the turnover of many capitals in one sphere of production, but the turnovers of a number of capitals in different spheres of production. So long as merchants' capital remains within the boundaries in which it is necessary the only difference is that this division of the functions of capital reduces the time exclusively needed for the process of circulation, that less additional capital is advanced for this purpose and that the loss of the total profits represented by the profits of merchants' capital is smaller than it would have been otherwise. If in the above example a capital of 720c plus 180v plus 180s assisted by a merchants' capital of a 190 leaves a profit of 162, or 18%, for the industrial capitalist or, in other words, implies a deduction of 18, then the additional capital required without the assistance of the independent merchants' capital would probably be 200, and the total advance to be made by the industrial capitalist would be

1100 instead of 900, which, with Surplus Value of 180, would mean a rate of profit of only 16 4/11%.¹

In this fashion does Marx prove to his own satisfaction that there is no clash of interest between productive and merchants' capital. How can there be when they are one and the same thing? Productive capital itself instituted this division of labor because, like the division of labor in production, it has helped to increase the profit rate. Marx holds that the operations of the merchant are really nothing but operations which must be performed under all circumstances, and as the cost for this service is less when the merchant performs it, he is in reality a benefactor to producing capital. What Marx sought to prove through his analysis of merchants' capital and merchants' profits was that the profit rate on merchants' capital is identically the same as on productive capital, and participates in proportion to the magnitude of its capital. He, in this manner, proved that merchants' profit is not the result of selling goods above their value, but at their value. Thus he proved once more that Surplus Value is extracted at but one point, the point of production.

A closer examination of the data Marx himself has furnished makes impossible the acceptance of his theory that there is harmony of interest between producing and merchants' capital, that the merchant is indispensable to the producing capitalist. Marx holds that *the capitalist mode of production is condi-*

¹ *Das Kapital*, vol. iii.

tioned on production for exchange, commerce on a large scale instead of with a few individual customers, and this requires also a merchant who does not buy for the satisfaction of his own individual wants, but concentrates the transactions of many buyers in one commercial transaction.¹ What does all this seek to imply? The clear implication is that profit on merchants' capital will not and cannot be eliminated except by first eliminating profit on productive capital. In other words, the entire profit system will be eliminated at one blow and the blow will be aimed at the profits created at the point of production. According to Marx, merchants' capital is destined to draw profits just so long as productive capital draws profits. Both must die out at the same time. This is so ordained in spite of the historical fact that merchants' profit is the oldest form of profit and that modern-capitalist profit is the very youngest form of profit.

Merchants' profit is, in fact, the parent to productive profit; nevertheless, according to Marx, the parent will not die except through the death of its child. While historically merchants' capital has passed through many changes, as Marx himself makes clear, its role in present-day society is fixed and it will enjoy its share of profits as long as there are profits to be shared.

Following Marx in his study of the history of merchants' profit, we find that merchants' capital represents historically the oldest free existence of capital. Marx says:

¹ *Das Kapital*, vol. iii, p. 385.

On the basis of *every* mode of production commerce promotes the production of surplus products destined for exchange, *for the purpose of increasing the enjoyments of wealth of the producers* (who are here understood to be the owners of the products). Commerce impregnates production more and more with the character of a production for exchange. Capital in the capacity of capital appears first in the process of circulation. In the process of circulation money first develops into capital. In the circulation the products first assume the character of exchange values of commodities and money. Capital can and must form in the process of circulation before it learns to control the extremes, that is, the various spheres of production between which circulation intervenes as a mediator. The circulation of money and commodities may act as an intermediary between spheres of production of widely different organization, whose internal structure is still predominantly adopted to the production of use-values. This independent status of the process of circulation by which various spheres of production are connected by means of a third link expresses two facts. On the one hand it shows that the circulation has not yet seized hold of production, but as yet regards it as an existing fact. On the other hand, it shows that the process of production has not yet absorbed circulation and made a phase of production of it. . . .

Within the capitalist mode of production—that is, as soon as capital has seized hold of production and given to it a wholly changed and specific form—merchants' capital appears merely as a capital with a *specific* function. But in all previous modes of production, and so much the more production ministers to the direct wants of the producers themselves, merchants' capital appears as the capital which performs *the* function of capital. . . . Within capitalist production the merchants' capital is reduced from its former independent existence to a special phase in the investment of capital in general and the compensation of profits reduces its rate of profit to the general average. Then it serves only as an agent of productive capital. . . . Where merchants' capital still predominates we find backward conditions. . . . The

independent development of merchants' capital stands, therefore, *in an inverse ratio to the general economic development of society.*¹ [My italics.]

This, then, is the history of merchants' capital as stated by Marx. What does it teach us? The outstanding fact is the continuous decline of merchants' capital as a factor in economic and social development. Merchants' capital profited most when production was crudest and with the development of the capitalist mode of production it became subordinated to industrial capital, accompanied by a steady decline in its share of the profits.

What interests us at this point is this: Has this decline now come to a sudden halt and will there be no further decline in the status of the merchant and therefore in his share of profits as long as the profit system lasts? Such appears to be the conclusion arrived at by Marx. But do the facts justify his conclusion? Let us examine the situation a little more closely.

Marx tells us that the economic development of society stands in inverse ratio to the independent development of merchants' capital. As society advanced, merchants' profit receded. Has economic development reached its utmost limits under the capitalist mode of production, is the question which must be answered. If it has not, will its development be accompanied by a decline in the profit falling to the share of merchants' capital; in other words, will modern economic evolution be consistent

¹ *Das Kapital*, vol. iii, p. 382.

with past history, despite the fact that "merchants' capital is but industrial capital in the sphere of circulation"?

The first question is easily answered. We know that economic evolution is advancing constantly. Every advance means an increase in the rate of profit. But what obstacles must be met and overcome in the process of economic advance with its inevitable increase in the profit rate? This is a fundamentally vital question upon which the views of none but an expert should be given credence. Fortunately for us, this question has already been answered by Karl Marx.

Bearing in mind the fact that all Surplus Value is created at the point of production and that it is realized only through the sale of the created values and that the costs entailed in this process help to depress the rate of profit, we can readily understand Marx's formula¹ that "the larger the merchants' capital in proportion to the industrial capital, the smaller is the rate of industrial profit, and vice versa." Thus does Marx himself furnish the evidence which proves that it is to the advantage of industrial capital to reduce the relation of merchants' capital to production. At another place² he notes that the industrial capitalist endeavors to limit these expenses of circulation to a minimum, just as he does with his expenses for constant capital.

Marx's views in detail are:

¹ *Das Kapital*, vol. iii, p. 339.

² *Ibid.*, p. 353.

The mere functions of capital in the sphere of circulation—the operations which the industrial capitalist must perform, first in order to realize the value of his commodities, and, secondly, in order to reconvert this value into elements of production; operations which promote the metamorphosis of the commodity-capital C-M-C, the acts of selling and buying—produce neither value nor Surplus Value. The time required for this purpose, objectively so far as the commodities, subjectively so far as the capitalist is concerned, *creates barriers to the production of value and Surplus Value*. What is true of the metamorphosis of commodity-capital in general is, as a matter of course, not in the least altered by the fact that a part of it may assume the shape of commercial capital or that the operations, by which the metamorphosis of commodity-capital is promoted, may become the particular business of a special class of capitalists. . . . The greater the number of turnovers of the industrial capital as a whole, the greater is the mass of profits, the mass of annually produced Surplus Value and therefore the rate of profit. . . . If the same industrial capital, under otherwise equal circumstances, particularly with the same organic composition, is turned over four times per year instead of twice, it produces twice as much Surplus Value and consequently profits. . . . The turnover of industrial capital is the combination of its time of production and time of circulation.¹ [My italics.]

Such is Marx's answer to our question. The sphere of circulation (and it is here where the merchant functions) acts as a check on production and therefore on the profits of producing capital. It is to the interest of producing capital as well as to economic and Social Evolution that the cost of circulation be constantly decreased. This need is *inimical to the interests of the merchant*. The progress of industry means retrogression for the merchant. Productive

¹ *Das Kapital*, vol. iii, p. 339.

capital uses the merchant for but one purpose, to help increase the rate of profit, and it will discard the merchant when he proves a hindrance to greater profits. We are forced to these conclusions by the data Marx himself has furnished.

Why, then, did Marx fail to arrive at this conclusion? Why did he, in fact, arrive at the very opposite conclusion? The answer must be sought in Marx's understanding of the operations of Social Evolution. Surplus Value is extracted at the point of production and realized at the point of consumption, and as during Marx's time more could be realized through the intervention of the merchant than without him, the merchant was therefore inevitable as long as production yielded Surplus Value. Such was Marx's conclusion. Every phase of the profit system would be with us until the day that would witness its sudden and complete collapse in its entirety. Exploitation arises at the point of production; it can be abolished nowhere except at the point of production. Such were the principles evolved by Marx from his studies of Social Evolution and such are the principles that guide the activities of the Marxists of to-day.

Marx's belief in the permanency of the merchant in capitalist society is one more proof that he did not understand the laws of Social Evolution and therefore could have no knowledge of their operations.

Had he understood the true laws of Social Evolution, had he recognized that all social progress is registered not through conflict at the point of production, but in response to the higher economic

interests of the majority as social beings or consumers, he would not have looked for Social Evolution to manifest itself through the class struggle at the point of production, but through the social struggle at the point of consumption.

The development of the capitalist mode of production, which is of special benefit to the producing capitalists, but which reacts to the benefit of society as a whole, demands the suppression of the merchant as an exploiter of society. Social evolution has completely disproved Marx's theory of the permanency of the merchant in modern society. The merchant is being rapidly displaced because it is to the interest of the producing capitalist and the consuming public and in line with social progress. To productive capital he acts as a check on turnover and therefore to profit. Productive capital has eliminated uncertainty and anarchy in production. The merchant has retained them in circulation. The producing capitalist must pay for the anarchy in circulation. The waste is appalling. Crisis, the bugbear of production, is fostered through anarchy in distribution. Security and certainty of a market is the aim and purpose of the producing capitalist. These constitute some of the reasons for conflict between producing and distributing capital. But this conflict of itself holds out no menace to merchants' capital. It is the fact that he stands in the way of social progress that makes his doom inevitable. He prevents society from obtaining greater benefits from the processes it has evolved as a means of solving the bread problem

and therefore Social Evolution must discard him. Slowly but surely society is displacing the merchant and assuming his duties in response to the harmony of interest of producing capital and the vast majority of consumers. The following quotations may be cited as illustrative of this tendency:

There is a movement on foot in England which is calculated to encourage the creation of trusts and combinations of all sorts with the view of the *ultimate elimination of the merchant from British trade*. It is reported that the movement has the *endorsement of one of the Government departments*. The British Board of Trade is said to have adopted the plan as its "considered policy," and is sending round the country missionaries who preach the gospel of cartels and trusts and arrange with taxpayers' money for the *extinction of the British merchant*. Manufacturers are being advised that the *sale of their products are no longer safe in private hands*. . . . The *London Economist*, for the purpose of pointing out something of the revolution that this departmental activity proposes to bring about in British trade, sets down the following as a few of the assumptions on which the policy is based: (1) Competition among the manufacturers is a bad thing. (2) Combines among manufacturers are good things. (3) The work of *manufacture* can, under proper Government supervision, be left to *private enterprise*, but the task of *selling* is too delicate for the individual and should be *entrusted to Government officials*. (4) The *merchant is an unnecessary person* (semi-officially described as a *parasite*) and the *Government is entitled to bring about his extinction and is qualified to take his place*. (5) The interests of the consumer will be so safe in the hands of manufacturing trusts that the Government can neglect them or at least defer them for subsequent consideration.¹ [My italics.]

¹ *Fear Extinction of British Merchants*, *New York Times*, December 30, 1917.

The *London Economist* is, of course, opposed to such social progress, "for it seems to combine the worst features of Socialism with the least defensible elements of individualism."

We have seen that society evolves in response to the harmony of interest of the majority as consumers, and that the majority is usually formed through a combination of the powerful and the useful as against the remnant of the past and the useless of the present. The powerful of our epoch are the owners of the means of production, the useful are all those in society who render a socially necessary service.

The quotations cited above prove that it is to the interest of the powerful—the producing capitalists—to have society eliminate the merchant and itself undertake distribution to the consumer. What is the attitude of the other factor, the useful, without which the majority necessary to set social progress in motion cannot be obtained?

The program of the British Labor Party is a good index of the attitude of the useful members of society towards this form of social progress. In this labor program we read as follows:

The Labor Party holds that the municipalities should not confine their activities to the necessarily costly services of education, sanitation and police; nor yet rest content with acquiring control of the local water, gas, electricity, and tramways; but that every facility should be afforded them to acquire (easily, quickly, cheaply) all the land they require and to extend their enterprises in housing and town planning, parks and public libraries, the provision of music and the organization of recreation, and also *to undertake besides the retailing of coal and other*

services of common utility, particularly the local supply of milk. . . . This question of retail prices of household commodities is emphatically the most practical of all political issues to the woman elector. The male politicians have too long neglected the grievances of the small household, which is the prey of every profiteering combination. . . . It is, so the Labor Party holds, *just as much the function of Government and just as necessary a part of the democratic regulation of industry to safeguard the interests of the community as a whole and those of all grades and sections of private consumers in the matter of prices* as it is by the factory and trade boards acts to protect the rights of the wage-earning producers in the matter of wages, hours of labor, and sanitation.¹ [My italics.]

Thus does the British Labor Party join hands with the owners of productive capital in a common demand that society put a stop to exploitation by the useless trader. The efficiency of productive capital and the interests of the consumer demand that society replace the merchant as the distributor of consumable wealth. Social Evolution cannot ignore the interests of a majority thus formed, so we are destined to see a tremendous impetus to the movement for social concern in immediate needs of the consumer. Thus does Social Evolution operate in England. But the laws that control its operations are not peculiar to any one nation. Social Evolution responds to an international law that requires no treaties.

In this country we see a similar combination against the merchant and in the interest of the consumer. The Labor parties recently formed in a

¹ *British Labor Party: Reconstruction Program.*

number of states, take the position that the welfare of the consumer demands the suppression of the dealer and the assumption of his duties by society. The following indicates Labor's attitude:

Reduction of the cost of living to a just level immediately and as a permanent policy by the development of co-operation and the *elimination of wasteful methods, middlemen, and all profiteering in creation and distribution of products.*¹ [My italics.]

President Woodrow Wilson, on August 8, 1919, went before Congress and in a special message exclusively devoted to this subject, demanded that society abolish the merchant and trader and assume national control of the processes of distribution as the only means of permanently reducing the cost of living.

President Wilson's opening statement was as follows: "I have sought this opportunity to address you because it is clearly my duty to call your attention to the present cost of living and to urge upon you with all the persuasive force of which I am capable, the legislative measures which would be most effective in controlling it and bringing it down."

This was followed with a recital of the well-known abuses to which society is subjected by the parasitic middlemen and merchants and after suggesting some immediate steps as a means of curbing their activities, President Wilson made the following very significant statement: "It does not seem to me that we can confine ourselves to detailed measures of

¹ Platform Labor Party of Illinois.

this kind, if it is indeed our purpose to *assume national control of the processes of distribution*. I take it for granted that *that is our purpose and our duty. Nothing less will suffice*. We need not hesitate to handle a national problem *in a national way*."

Clearly, Social Evolution holds out a rather hopeless future for the merchant or middleman.

It may be said that there is very little of a practical nature to indicate social concern in the distribution of consumable wealth. Those who understand the true laws of Social Evolution require but little of a practical nature as a means of discerning the trend of the times. Enough, however, has already been accomplished in a practical way to enable even a Marxist to read the handwriting on the wall.

We must again turn to Germany if we wish to observe social concern in the distribution of the necessities of life. We cannot go into a full description of German municipal activity on behalf of the consumer. That has already been done by others. We are dealing with the historic interpretation of this phenomenon. To recall that the scope of municipal activity ranges all the way from public baths to theaters and dance halls is sufficient to make one appreciate the extent of social concern in the welfare of the consumer.

It is, however, necessary to dwell a little more fully on the latest object of social concern—the food supply.

Either by direct production or by contracts with existing co-operative societies, or with societies specially formed for the

purpose, many German cities have arranged for the supply of meat, vegetables, and other foodstuffs at lower prices than those at which private traders were delivering. Thus, in 1912, no less than 149 German cities (19 of which had a population exceeding 100,000) sold potatoes and, in many cases, other vegetables also, direct to their citizens. Four German towns, namely, Ulm, Lennep, Wermelskerchen, and Rentlingen, produced milk from municipally owned herds, and sold it direct to their inhabitants. Many other cities, including such large ones as Mannheim, Freiburg, Kreuznach and Offenbach-on-Main, purchase milk and resell it to their citizens either at cost or at a very small profit, and Freiburg has, in addition, taken up the sale of condensed milk.¹

W. H. Dawson tells us that:

Inquiries made by the Berlin Statistical Office in 62 important towns showed that in 60 of these towns, with a combined population of over 15,000,000, the authorities had in 1911 and 1912 organized a meat supply in order to relieve the prevailing scarcity and counteract the high prices. . . . Many of the arrangements devised to meet a temporary emergency have now been placed on a permanent basis, and it is probable that German towns will in no distant future add to their other enterprises practical measures for making certain branches of the food supply *independent of the interest and convenience of private traders.*² [My italics.]

In France the Government has undertaken the distribution of food. This is not a war, but a peace measure, having been inaugurated six months after the signing of the armistice. This move has brought about tremendous savings to the consumers at the expense of the dealers.

¹ Emil Davies, *Collectivism in the Making*, p. 54.

² *Municipal Life and Government in Germany*.

We have now reviewed the four principal forms taken by modern Social Evolution, namely: (1) Social and industrial reform; (2) socialization of transportation and communication; (3) direct taxation; (4) socialization of distribution. Our studies have revealed that each of these represents a breakdown of the old order and the evolving of the new. It is now clear that all these social changes have been brought about not through conflict at the point of production, but in response to the fundamental law that has operated throughout all history; *viz.*, the higher economic interests of the majority as social beings or consumers. The modern method of solving the problem of existence, the social method of production, was called into existence through the operation of this law.

To-day Social Evolution concerns itself largely with the task of distributing the benefits of modern production. In past epochs a form of exploitation came to be abolished only through a change in the method of production. It was not, however, the exploitation at the point of production which brought about a change in the method of production. New modes of production have always been called into existence in response to the economic interests of the majority as consumers. An advanced mode of production represented a step in the direction of a solution to the problem of existence.

With the abolition of a mode of production came to an end the form of exploitation that was peculiar to it, but only as an accompanying incident to social

progress. This can be readily realized from the fact that an increased ratio of exploitation at the point of production is an inseparable phenomenon of all social progress. The capitalist form of production being the most perfected yet evolved, shows a greater ratio of exploitation at the point of production than any previous epoch.

We see then that Social Evolution, unlike Marxists, never stands still. It is sweeping on with an irresistible force in the direction of its historic purpose.

What interests us at this point is this: What, in terms of Surplus Value and the class struggle, is the significance of all the social changes we have enumerated above?

We must never lose sight of the fact so strongly emphasized by Marx that, in modern nations, wealth production is a social process—that the total national income is the product of the combined efforts of every useful member of the national family.

But the social means of wealth production is not owned by the nation. The ownership is vested in a small group. This group of private owners withholds from society a large proportion of the socially created products. In other words, they enjoy the benefits of *social Surplus Value*. But the withheld products must first be sold if the social Surplus Value is to be realized. Productive capital concentrates its activities on the production of values. A number of new factors enter into the process of sale. The products must be transported to the market and distributed so that they may become accessible to

the consumer. These respective activities have become the exclusive functions of special capitalist groups. Marx made clear that the profits which fall to these groups constitute a portion of the Social Surplus originally extracted at the point of production by the tool-owning class. In other words, the owners of the means of production give up a portion of their social Surplus Value to the capitalists who devote themselves to the business of transporting and distributing products, and thus realizing their values.

If the extraction of Surplus Value is the basis for the modern class struggle it becomes obvious that the class struggle must be waged against any and all who profit through Surplus Value. But it is not a class, but society, that is the creator of all value; therefore, it is not a class but society that is exploited of social Surplus Value. The struggle is not a class struggle, but a social struggle against a class, the profit-making class.

When society undertakes an economic function, such as the public ownership of railroads or the distribution of consumable products as the municipalization of the milk supply, the Surplus Value heretofore obtained by the railroad-owning capitalists or the private milk distributors now reverts back to society, and the social struggle is to that degree eliminated. In these specified instances the capitalist principle—profit—had to yield to the Socialist principle—service. The change manifests itself in a decrease in cost to the consumer.

The means of financing society's economic activities is found in the principle of direct taxation. This is the purest form of expropriating the expropriators. The income of the entire capitalist class comes from society in the form of social Surplus Value. When society takes back a portion by means of direct taxation, the expropriators are to that degree expropriated. When the income from this form of taxation is used for the purpose of financing an economic function assumed by society we have a situation in which the entire capitalist class is compelled to give up a portion of its Surplus Value to be used for the purpose of undermining the capitalist system and replacing it with an installment of the Socialist system.

But we have seen that Social Evolution is not responsive to struggles, whether waged by a class or society. Struggles are an effect, not a cause, and Social Evolution is governed by laws that deal with causes. All struggles are but incidents in the process of arriving at a solution to the problem of existence.

Who, for instance, would have the hardihood to contend that it was the class struggle that developed Germany into a socialized State? National efficiency was the principle behind every social measure undertaken by Germany. How well it has fulfilled its purpose is a matter of historic record. Progress for the nation was the thought behind every measure in the interest of the individual. It was the harmony of interest of the majority as social beings and not

conflict at the point of production that evolved Germany so rapidly into the socialized State.

To overcome a belated start Germany was compelled to apply in a very considerable degree the social principle clearly indicated by the modern system of wealth production. In the interest of the majority as social beings, Germany discarded the capitalist principle and applied the Socialist principle.

The application of the Socialist principle not only enabled Germany to overcome every handicap, but actually to outstrip every capitalist nation in productive efficiency. So much so that now the nations that but a generation ago were models for Germany are to-day compelled in turn to use Germany as their model. German national efficiency has given a tremendous impetus to the application of the social principle in England and the United States. Germany outstripped English capitalism with Socialism. England and the United States are trying to meet German efficiency, not through the capitalist principle, but by discarding capitalism and substituting the Socialist principle. Thus in England and the United States national efficiency is beginning to have the same meaning that it had in Germany, the ever-extending application of the Socialist principle.

The extension of government domain over economic functions in England and the United States follows the path traversed in Germany; the retention of the principal means of production in private hands and an ever-increasing social concern in the distribution of consumable wealth.

Productive efficiency and social progress require that henceforth the Socialist principle rule in these departments. The high state of efficiency which must inevitably follow a wholehearted application of the Socialist principle will bring nearer the day that will prove industrial capital a fetter to the further development of production, and therefore inimical to social progress, the aim of which is to secure to society its means of existence. When that stage is reached the interests of the majority as consumers will demand that the capitalist principle in production be eliminated and the Socialist principle substituted in its place. The controllers of productive capital in all probability will not form a component part of this majority, although it is not so preposterous an idea as may appear on first thought. In the first place, the controllers of industrial capital will no longer be the powerful group in their present industrial sense. No group that stands in the way of the immediate concern of Social Evolution is powerful in the economic sense; political impotency follows as a natural consequence. In the second place, the Socialist principle will have been too well ingrained in the social fabric to hold out any hope of success in a fight against its extension, and lastly, industrial capital will by that time have been deprived through direct taxation of so large a proportion of its Surplus Value or profit that it will gladly turn over to society its plants and accept bonds assuring a minimum profit without further risk or contact with industry. These bonds will no

doubt yield a very modest income and only during the lifetime of the original holders.

All this is in the nature of speculation, but speculation based upon a study of the processes of Social Evolution. For the present, productive capital appears safe from social interference. Be it the most gigantic trust, Social Evolution does not indicate any immediate danger to its private controllers. In fact, productive capital owes its immunity to its trustified state. This is the very opposite to the generally accepted Socialist view. Socialists have looked to the industrial trusts as the first to be socialized. This view arises from the fact that Socialists have concentrated their attention solely upon industrial development and not on social development, which gives rise to industrial development.

The immediate needs of the majority in society as consumers is always the first concern of Social Evolution. That is why Social Evolution concerns itself first with consumable wealth and not with industrial capital. Distribution of the annually created social wealth is bound to be the outstanding phenomenon of the social process of the immediate future. The capitalist principle is to be eliminated from every department serving the needs of the consumer. The portion from the original fund of Surplus Value falling to these groups is to go back to society.

Marxian principles do not assign any historic role to the masses as *consumers*. It is only as Socialist Party platforms get away from Marxian principles that they seem to recognize that the masses have an

interest as consumers. Socialist literature gives scant consideration to the consumer.

Karl Kautsky develops the consumer point of view perhaps more fully than any other recognized Socialist. He says:

The possessor of labor power gains more in declines of price and loses more with rising prices than buyers of other products. His standpoint in the goods market is in antagonism to that of the sellers. In spite of the fact that he produces all and consumes but a portion of his product, his *standpoint* is that of the *consumer* and not that of the *producer*. His product does not belong to him, but to his exploiters, the capitalists. It is the capitalist who appears upon the market as a producer and seller with the product of the labor of the wage worker. The laborer appears there only as the buyer of the means of life. In consequence of these facts, the laborers are placed in antagonism to the sellers.¹

While these facts to Socialists appear to be matters of recent discovery, scarcely worthy of more than passing notice, to Social Evolution they have formed the historic basis for all social progress.

The tendency that leads to the elimination of the capitalist principle and substitution of the Socialist principle in transportation, communication and distribution is, as we have seen, not at all a product of a special form of government. We have found, in fact, that autocratic Germany showed a greater degree of development in this direction than any other nation. England has come forward in recent years and democratic America is considerably be-

¹ *The Road to Power*, p. 105.

hind in the movement. But it would be a great mistake not to recognize the relative merit of these steps to the peoples of the several countries. Socialization means much more to the people of England or the United States than it did to the German people. The fact that socialization on a considerable scale manifested itself first in autocratic Germany may have something to do with the failure to appreciate its full social significance. Socialization without democracy is not and cannot be Socialism. But this is no reason why Socialists should fail to study its historic and social significance.

With nations rapidly passing through a revolutionary transformation from mere governments of men into administrators of things; with the assumption of economic functions by the State proceeding at an ever-accelerated rate, Socialists should do more than oppose—they should understand.

To understand social phenomena was the task to which Marx dedicated his life. He despised fossilized views. He turned his back on his own views as readily as on those of others. The processes of Social Evolution alone were his guiding light. That is why, while in 1850, we find him saying that "the only solution of the ten-hour problem as of all problems arising from the antagonism of capital and labor is the proletarian revolution," in 1864, when the ten-hour law had become an accomplished fact without a proletarian revolution he, like the great student that he was, was quick to grasp its tremendous social significance. He drew attention to the

significance of the ten-hour law in an Inaugural Address delivered before the International Working-men's Association on September 28, 1864:

... The wonderful results of this labor measure (the British ten-hour law) were of more than mere practical significance. . . . The struggle for the legal limitation of the workday was the more bitter because it was not merely a check upon individual greed, but also a direct intervention in the great battle waged between the blind law of supply and demand—the political economy of the bourgeoisie—and the principle of social regulation of production, which is the quintessence of the political economy of the laboring class. And therefore the ten-hour bill was not only a great practical success, it was the victory of a principle. In the bright sunlight of day the bourgeois political economy was here vanquished for the first time by the political economy of the working class.¹

We respectfully commend these views to our brethren, the revolutionary, scientific Marxians who mouth about "the class struggle" and lay down a peremptory demand for a dictatorship of the proletariat. To Marx, not the principle of proletarian regulation of production, but the principle of social regulation of production, was the quintessence of the political economy of the laboring class.

To Marx, working-class political economy was not a class principle, but a social principle. The social principle wherever applied is based upon the political economy of the working class. Close students of this phenomenon seem to be in agreement that socialization has a tendency to promote political democracy.

¹ Quoted by Simkhovitch, pp. 123-124, in *Marxism versus Socialism*. [My italics.]

The Fabian Research Bureau tells us that:

With the alteration of function, governments tend to change in spirit, progressively discarding the authoritarian conception of dominion with its correlative of obedience to coercive law, and adopting instead the more modern conception of National Housekeeping, with its correlative of conformity to the common rules designed only to secure the common comfort.

It would, indeed, be strange if it were otherwise. The elimination of the profit principle is a social process in the interest of the nation as social beings. National interest is advanced at the expense of the profit-making class within the nation. Organized society is gradually assuming the functions of the profit-making class. When the task shall have been completed there will be no exploiting class; therefore, no justification for the repression of democracy. And as Marx says:

When in the course of development class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been centralized in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so-called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another.¹

Political and industrial democracy are inevitable, not necessarily in vindication of justice, but because of their efficacy as social instruments by which to arrive at a solution to the basic social problem—security in the means of life. Man has evolved social production as a means of attaining that end. But the end is not and cannot be attained without po-

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 46.

itical and industrial democracy. The harmony of interest of the majority as social beings makes industrial democracy as inevitable as was political democracy.

Our studies have made clear that we are in the midst of an epoch of Social Revolution which, proceeding at an ever-accelerated pace, has already succeeded in undermining the capitalist mode of transportation, communication and exchange and that all these revolutionary changes have been brought about in response to the same laws that led to social progress in all previous epochs.

We find ourselves in complete agreement with Marx when he says:

Of course, in the beginning this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which in the course of the movement outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.¹

Society has made "despotic inroads upon the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production." Property has been made to understand that society has rights which property is compelled to respect. Public Service corporations such as railroads, street car lines, telephone and telegraph corporations, electric and gas supply corporations, etc., etc., are curbed in the amount of profit they

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 45.

may exact from society. These properties cannot force from the public the increase in wages they may be compelled to grant to their employees. Whereas properties that have not felt despotic inroads on their rights can boost prices as high as "the traffic will bear." Where society has stepped in, prices have a tendency to remain fixed, no matter how much of an increase there may have been in the cost of operation.

As for "despotic inroads on the conditions of bourgeois production," we must confess that very little progress has been made in this direction. For Marx to have looked for this *in the beginning* is but one more proof that he did not understand the operation of the laws of Social Evolution. Even at this day Social Evolution shows very little concern over the means of production. But if Social Evolution has ignored the bourgeois conditions of production, it has been extremely busy making despotic inroads on the conditions of bourgeois transportation, communication and distribution. The bourgeois condition, that is, the profit principle, is fast disappearing in these departments of social relations and is being supplanted by the social condition. Despotic inroads in the bourgeois conditions of distribution is the latest phenomenon of the operations of Social Evolution. Marx, from the nature of his understanding of the laws of Social Evolution, could not foresee inroads in the bourgeois conditions of distribution, except through inroads in the bourgeois conditions of production. The view that the bene-

ficiaries of the bourgeois conditions of production would themselves stimulate the inroads in the bourgeois conditions of distribution because of its immediate benefit to them would to Marx have appeared as preposterous and Utopian. Yet Social Evolution proved this to be an incontrovertible fact.

We know that Social Evolution cannot be arrested in its course. It may be retarded, but cannot be stopped. It must continue its operations in response to the same laws that have brought about the present stage of progress.

Every phenomenon of modern Social Evolution blazens forth the fact that social progress is dictated by the social interests of the majority. And what is the method used to attain this progress? Not by uprisings of the populace against the Government, and surely not by civil war—one portion of the people against another—but by the majority of consumers using their organized authority as the City, State or National Government, by means of which to break down and stamp out social exploitation.

Instead of uprisings against the Government by the populace as in the case of former revolutions, we see the “populace,” *i.e.*, the majority of social beings themselves organized as the Government uprising against their exploiters. Both are social revolutions, aimed against antisocial minorities, the difference being that former revolutions were directed against the Government, which itself was the oppressor, while to-day the people constitute the Government and use their organized power against the anti-

social portion of the populace. Every gain is obtained by the majority in its organized capacity as the Government. And every gain is retained by the majority in its organized capacity as the Government. The majority does not have to wage a civil war against the exploiters. The majority organized as the Government is waging a social war against an antisocial minority. This antisocial minority cannot wage a civil war because it is hopelessly divided into innumerable groups with conflicting interests.

We are in the midst of the social revolution and nothing can prevent the attaining of the final goal—the abolition of profit.

The modern scientific (?) Socialists who still uphold the view of a civil war place themselves in a most untenable and ridiculous position in the eyes of the observant and thinking element of every nation. They still preach the antisocial class struggle and call for a revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The theory that social progress is registered through the class struggle precludes the idea of progress except through civil war. If there was no civil war there was no progress.

But they are bewildered. They don't know whither they are tending. They have no means of explaining the social phenomena manifesting itself before their very eyes. "Are we making progress or are we but killing time while waiting for the revolution?" This is the question that is perplexing them. *They cannot see the Socialist forest on account of the Socialist trees!*

CHAPTER XIII

“MARXISM” AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

IT is doubtful if Shakespeare's genius ever conceived of a more heartrending tragedy of unrequited love than is to be found in the Socialists' relation to the Labor Movement.

History records no parallel to the undying devotion of Socialists to Labor. If Labor had responded with anything like such ardor, what a powerful combination they would have made!

But Labor does not give in proportion as it receives. It seems to act in the spirit of a fascinating damsel who, having once captured the heart of her wooer, feels secure in its undisputed possession. And no beloved one could possibly have more justification for this assumption than has Labor. No matter how much they may be spurned by Labor, the Socialists, as “Marxists,” must remain true to their first love. Marxian principles admit of no alternative.

Marxian principles concern themselves with the welfare of the producer, with exploitation at the point of production. Labor unions also concern themselves with the welfare of the producer, with exploitation at the point of production. These rea-

sons alone ought to furnish sufficient basis for wedded bliss between labor unions and Socialists.

But the Marxians' attachment for Labor has a far deeper explanation. Marxian principles are based on the theory that social progress is registered through class conflict. This theory vests Labor with an historic mission, which is:

To organize itself as a class and by means of a revolution make itself the ruling class and as such sweep away by force the old conditions of production.¹

Not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons (economic development) that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.²

As the bringing about of the new order is entirely dependent on the proletariat, Socialists must make their appeal to this one class, the class that is exploited at the point of production. Such an appeal constitutes the measure of their scientific Socialism.

The Socialists of one country judge the quality of the science of the Socialists of another country by this test: do they concentrate their appeal to the proletariat that is exploited at the point of production; if so, they are "revolutionary scientific Socialists." Marxian principles do not recognize the workers in any other capacity save that of producers who are exploited at the point of production. The workers' interests as citizens, as social beings, are matters that Marxian principles completely

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 46.

² *Ibid*, p. 22.

ignore. They center their interest solely on producers for whom the doors of the Marxians are thrown wide open.

The International Socialist Congresses do not consist alone of Socialist delegates. The International welcomes labor union representatives. More than that, it even welcomes non-Socialist political parties, as long as they represent labor unions. The British Labor Party's admission to the Congress is an example of this attitude. Besides the five votes allotted to the British Labor Party out of the ten allowed to British political organizations, ten more votes were allowed to the British labor unions, thus giving the labor unions fifteen out of a total of twenty votes allotted to Great Britain.

Another instance of Socialist devotion to Labor is to be had in the action of the Stuttgart Congress, which refused a vote to the Australian Socialist Party because it was not a member of the non-Socialist Labor Party of that country. And this party did not even ask for admission to the International Congress!

The Congress of the French Socialist Party has gone even further than that. It has gone on record as holding the view that labor unions can work directly for Socialism on the economic field, "*Unionism having the same aim as Socialism.*"

There is therefore little room for doubting the devotion of Marxian Socialism to labor unionism.

Now let us see what is the attitude of labor unionism towards Marxian Socialism.

England is the classic capitalist country and the trade union movement preceded the Socialist movement. The Socialist Party at once concentrated its efforts to capture the labor movement, but to this day has failed to win the unions' support for the Socialist political program. In Germany and Austria this has been partially accomplished and only because the trade unions were created by the Socialists.

In the United States, the trade union movement being older than the Socialist Party also stands aloof from the Socialist political program. What is the explanation for this, since the principles of both are the same? While the trade union may not recognize the fact, its activities are nevertheless based on the class struggle, it aims to serve the welfare of the producer by limiting exploitation at the point of production.

The Marxians base their principles on this conflict at the point of production. Which side is responsible for the lack of union between the two movements? Which side is inconsistent? The Socialist parties have always accused the unions of inconsistency. They are in the habit of saying to the trade unionist: *Do not scab on Election Day. Strike at the ballot box. Go into the political field.* But the trade unionists have not followed this advice. Are they inconsistent? Let us see.

Marxian theories and trade union theories are thoroughly antisocial. Trade unions, however, are constructive agencies, serving to protect the economic interests of the workers as producers.

But it is only in the factory and in the trade union that the worker thinks in terms of a producer. In all else affecting his life, he thinks in common terms with his fellow citizens, that is, as a social being, as a consumer. The Marxians insist that he take his trade union principles into politics, that he use his political power to serve his interests as a producer. The trade unionist refuses to use his social power for antisocial purposes, and therefore denies political support to the party that bases its principles upon the class interests of producers.

Then there is another matter that puzzles the minds of the trade unionists. The Socialist Party claims that a movement to be scientific must be a class movement of producers. Yet it comes forward with a practical program that is based upon the social interests of consumers!

The trade unionist finds himself lacking the fine training that would qualify him to denote either the science or the logic for this phenomenon.

In this inconsistency is to be found the explanation for the chasm that separates the trade union movement from the Socialist movement. It is not, as has been formerly supposed, the trade unions that are inconsistent. On the contrary, they have been consistent throughout. It is the Marxians with their antisocial theories versus their social practice that are inconsistent. The trade unions refused to be a party to such inconsistencies.

In recent years trade unions have shown a tendency to consider political action. British labor

unions were the first to try the experiment. The British Labor Party entered the political arena on a platform based almost entirely upon the welfare of the producer. Its aim was to secure progressive labor legislation.

Did it meet with much success? It is a well-known fact that the British Labor Party's record of accomplishments is far from inspiring. The explanation for this is simple. Our studies have proved that all progress is registered not through conflict at the point of production, but in response to the harmony of interest of the majority as social beings or consumers. This is a universal law operating in Social Evolution. The British Labor Party's attempt to promote social progress was Utopian, in opposition to the laws of Social Evolution, and therefore doomed to failure. Practical experience soon taught the lesson that had already been learned by the Marxians, that a political party which made the class struggle at the point of production its principal concern was doomed.

In practice, the Marxians were compelled to repudiate their theoretical antisocial principles and adopt a platform based on the welfare of the consumer. What growth and influence they have since attained is entirely due to this action.

The British Labor Party's anxiety to stay in the field, to grow and to extend its influence and usefulness, compelled it to go beyond its original purpose and also adopt a Socialist program, *i.e.*, a program based upon the welfare of the consumer. Its

famous Reconstruction Program is founded on this new principle.

This program of the British Labor Party has attracted international attention because it concerns itself primarily with social welfare, with the welfare of the consumer.

So anxious is the British Labor Party to impress all with the fact that it is no longer a Labor Party in the sense that its principal concern is the welfare of the producer, that it feels called upon to reiterate again and again that not a single one of its long list of proposals is in "any sense a class proposal." Which is perfectly true. The program is consistently Socialistic throughout and therefore in harmony with the laws of Social Evolution. It aims to accelerate social progress in the interest of the majority as social beings. If the British Labor Party does not swerve from its social principles it is destined to play an historic role in the process of eliminating the profit principle from the life of the English nation.

Although the British Labor Party had been in the field for some years, its experience was not of the character to encourage the formation of a Labor Party in this country.

However, in 1918 the American Labor Party was launched at Bridgeport, Connecticut, due largely to the profound impression made upon Labor by the reconstruction program of the British Labor Party. Labor saw it acclaimed as a great, constructive document. Every faction in society save the reactionary minority seemed to vie with one another in singing

its praises. The reactionists did not dare give voice to their opposition.

The American trade unionists undertook a serious study of that program. They soon found the explanation for the universal enthusiasm it had spontaneously aroused. They found that the Reconstruction Program of the British Labor Party was not a labor program, but a social program. They found that it concerned itself not with exploitation at the point of production, but with the welfare of the great mass of the people as citizens, as social beings, as consumers. It is to this fact that the Reconstruction Program owes its great popularity.

The lesson sank deep into the minds of the American trade unionists. They undertook at once to follow in the footsteps of their English comrades. They drew up a platform for the American Labor Party, the basic principles of which are identical with those of the Reconstruction Program of the English Labor Party. It does not make a class appeal, but breathes the social spirit throughout. The welfare of the consumer, social well-being is the dominant note throughout the platform. If the American Labor Party adheres to these principles—and no doubt it will—it is bound to become the dominant political party in this country.

So we see that the labor unions have at last accepted the advice of the Marxians and have gone into politics. Are the Marxians happy? Are the Marxians of this country flocking to the support of the American Labor Party? If so, they have cer-

tainly accomplished their aim in a manner admirably calculated to avoid noise or detection. But past experience makes us doubt that Marxians will support the Labor Party. The Marxians will never forgive the trade unions for their consistency. Why isn't the American Labor Party based upon the same principles as the trade union movement, that is, on the welfare of the producer, on exploitation at the point of production, is what the Marxians will demand to know. Those are the principles upon which the Socialist Party is based. The Marxians will deny recognition or support to the American Labor Party as long as it does not do the same. Let the theoretical principles of the American Labor Party be the same as those that underlie the trade union movement, let them be based upon exploitation at the point of production, and the Marxians are satisfied. With the practical program they will not quarrel. It can remain just as it is, a social program based on diametrically opposite principles, principles that concern themselves with social welfare, with consumer welfare. The best guarantee that the Marxians can offer that they will not oppose such glaring inconsistency is that it conforms with their own practice. The theoretical principles of the Socialist Party are in direct conflict with the principles upon which its practical program is based.

Fortunately for the American Labor Party and society in general, it is not likely to pay much attention to the demands of the Marxists. It is not bound down by dogmas that keep the International sci-

tific Socialist movement in a perpetual state of war, a war which is now receiving its highest expression in Russia and Germany. The American Labor Party will not glorify the *producer*—which the Marxists have distorted to mean only the wage-earner—nor will it make a fetish of exploitation at the point of production. The producer is a consumer in common with the rest of his fellow-beings, the producer is a citizen in common with his fellow-citizens, the producer is a social being in common with all other members of society, and the American Labor Party will not only champion his interests as such, but by virtue of community of interests will attract support that as trade unionists or producers they could not possibly obtain. This support will give to the American Labor Party such strength and influence that it will be in a position to accomplish more in ten years in the way of improving the condition of the trade union members than has been accomplished in fifty years of trade union activity.

This will be possible without talk of revolution or civil war. The American Labor Party, through the support of the useful citizenship of this country, will use the power of organized society, the Government, as the means by which to obtain for society an ever larger proportion of the social wealth created by society. It will direct its first efforts to the problem of distribution as that is the problem of immediate concern to the vast majority in society.

In the meantime what will happen to the Socialist Party? It will have its conventions and some dele-

gate will have the courage to direct the attention of the Marxists to the activities of the American Labor Party. He will try to point out that it is doing the same work as the Socialist Party. Why not affiliate? he will ask. We might at least recognize them, will be his plea. That will be the signal for the fireworks. What fervid revolutionary speeches will pour forth; what denunciations and recriminations will be hurled to and fro, and then, after long hours and perhaps days of debate, a resolution denouncing the American Labor Party for its denial of the "class struggle" will be enthusiastically adopted amid thunderous applause. If it should be the good fortune of the American Labor Party to escape denunciation, this will not mean that affiliation will result. The experience of the Non-Partisan League is proof of that.

The attitude of the Socialist Party towards the Non-Partisan League was stated in no uncertain terms by the national convention held in April, 1917.

We quote the following:

The following is the report of the resolutions committee on the relations of the Socialist Party to the National Non-Partisan League, *which was adopted by the Socialist Convention yesterday*:

Whereas, A new political party called the National Non-Partisan League that, according to the report made upon the same by Comrade John Spargo to this convention, offers promise of speedily acquiring political power for a certain division of the industrial class of the United States, *vs.*, the toilers of the soil; and,

Whereas, In North Dakota and other States it appears that *large numbers of comrades have affiliated with the League in the*

hope of speedy economic reforms through political victory under the banners of the League and such movement being already at work in many other States, with a fair promise of success in all, and it being apparent that the National Non-Partisan League presents a problem for solution that must be met and must be solved if the Socialist Party is to continue as a political or social force in such States as are invaded by the League. It being further manifest that many of the comrades in such League states propose to affiliate with the said League merely for the reason that they mistake the mission of the Socialist Party.

It therefore becomes the duty of this convention to *reaffirm the principles of Socialism* and declare the position of the party in the performance of its historic mission. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party, being the political arm of the working class in its fight for industrial freedom, and its power resting mainly in its clear-cut specific declaration of political and economic principles rather than in the number of votes cast for the party candidates and the purpose of the Socialist movement being the emancipation of the working class from economic servitude by the abolition of the entire system of capitalist exploitation rather than the election to office of candidates for the purpose of speedy economic reforms;

It is therefore declared to be the sense of this convention that all State organizations facing the solution of this question be urged to remember that to fuse or to compromise is to be swallowed up and utterly destroyed; that they be urged to maintain the *revolutionary position of the Socialist Party*, and maintain in the utmost possible vigor the propaganda of Socialism, unadulterated by association of office seekers, to the end that the solidarity of the working class, the principles of International Socialism may continue to lay the foundation for the *Social Revolution*.

The Social Revolution, not political office, is the end and aim of the Socialist Party.

No compromise, no political trading.¹ [My italics.]

¹ Special dispatch to New York *Call*, from St. Louis, April 13, 1917.

This is how the Socialist Party met and solved the problem of the National Non-Partisan League. "Many of the Comrades propose to affiliate with the League merely for the reason that *they mistake the mission of the Socialist Party.*" Precisely, They studied the practical program of the Socialist Party and arrived at the erroneous conclusion that it was the platform of a *socialist* Party. The national convention of the Socialist Party apprises these Comrades of their grave mistake. It tells them that the Socialist Party is not a socialist Party, but the "political arm of the working class"; that *social revolution, not political office*, is the end and aim of the Socialist Party. And as the Non-Partisan League is a socialist party, in that it concerns itself with social welfare, the Comrades must have nothing to do with it.

So we have found that there is considerable justification for the accusation of inconsistency in the relations of the trade unions to the Socialist Party. But the blame is not with the trade unions, but with the Marxists.

CHAPTER XIV

“MARXISM” AND THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

THE growth of the co-operative movement is practically contemporaneous with the growth of the International Socialist movement.

There are two phases to this movement, co-operatives of producers and co-operatives of consumers.

What has been the attitude of Marxists towards these two may be gathered from the following:

For all Socialists of the sixties, societies for *production* had been the chief consideration, the co-operative stores were minor. The opinion prevailed to which even Engels in his essays on the housing question gave expression—that as soon as co-operative stores everywhere included the mass of the workers, they would certainly have as a consequence a reduction of wages.¹

Bernstein then quotes from a resolution drawn up by Marx for the Geneva Congress:

We recommend workmen to embark on co-operative *production* rather than co-operative *stores*. The latter touch only the surface of the economic system of to-day, the first strikes at its foundations.²

For Marx to take this position should occasion no surprise. It was perfectly consistent with his ideas

¹ E. Bernstein, *Evol. Soc.*, p. 111.

² *Ibid.*, p. 111.

of the operations of the laws of Social Evolution. He believed that social progress is registered through the class struggle at the point of production. In advising the workers to organize co-operatives for production, he believed that he was working in harmony with Social Evolution and accelerating its progress.

He was true to his principles. They concern themselves with the welfare of the producer, with exploitation at the point of production; therefore, when two forms of co-operatives presented themselves, Marx did not hesitate in making his choice.

In this practical application of his theories we obtain a striking illustration of their antisocial character.

The co-operative of producers is a self-governed workshop. The class struggle is abolished, for there is no surplus value extracted. Each worker obtains the full product of his toil. Every grievance of the producer as voiced by Marx has been fully met. But in what direction has all this taken us, towards or away from Socialism?

Let us take one industry, say the shoe industry, as one in which all of Marx's grievances have been met. Only the workers of each shop would share in the amount that their finished product brought in the market. The shops will have to compete with each other for a market for their product just as the capitalists do to-day. To prevent the inevitable ruination that must follow unbridled competition they will have to resort to combination just as the capitalists do to-day. This will lead to monopoly

just as it led to monopoly under capitalism. The community would be helpless and entirely at the mercy of these shops. They would be in a position to oppress society just as the capitalists do to-day. Their interests and ideals would be antisocial just as the interests and ideals of the capitalist class are antisocial.

Nor is this all. The unusually large returns that the new conditions in the shoe industry made possible would be responsible for an influx of new workers into this industry.

Would it be to the interest of the original group to admit unlimited membership? Hardly. They would put down conditions that would soon duplicate the present capitalist situation; workers would be permitted to work, providing they yielded certain concessions to the original owners.

Thus the foundation for a capitalist system of society would again be laid. With the extraction of Surplus Value the class struggle at the point of production would be renewed.

Such would be the logical and inevitable outcome of co-operatives of production. This has been borne out by experience.

Wherever we find the "self-governing workshop successful to-day," says Mrs. S. Webb, "a close investigation shows that the "self-government" of the workers is a delusion and that the association consists, in greater or smaller proportion, of capitalist members who are not workers and of wage workers who are not members."¹

¹ *Problems of Modern Industry*, p. 196.

Yet Marx believed that the co-operatives of producers "strike at the foundations of the economic system of to-day."

The theoretical principles of the Socialist parties are identical with those that underlie co-operatives for production. Both are antisocial, both are Utopian because they conflict with the laws of Social Evolution. Had the Socialist parties remained true to Marxian principles, their strength and influence to-day would about equal that of the Anarchists. The co-operatives of production that had received Marx's indorsement and blessings have everywhere led a most uneventful existence.

Let us now turn our attention to the other form of co-operative—the co-operatives of consumers.

Marx advised against these because they "touch only the surface of the economic system of to-day." It is, of course, true that consumer co-operatives do not concern themselves with exploitation at the point of production. Their sole concern is exploitation at the point of consumption. Not the means of production, but the distribution of the created product, is their first concern. Their ideal is not the welfare of the producer, but the welfare of the consumer. The co-operative of the consumer is based on principles that are social in their nature and thus are in harmony with the laws of Social Evolution.

To these facts and to these facts alone must be attributed the tremendous growth of the consumer co-operative movement. It has not had the good

fortune—or shall we say misfortune—of having an elaborate theoretical system as a basis for its foundation. On the contrary, all the so-called social movements, each with its own theoretical system, were fundamentally opposed to this movement. Why, then, did it prosper upon so unprecedented a scale? There is only one answer—because it operated in harmony with the laws of Social Evolution.

Social Evolution is intensely practical. It concerns itself with the problem of existence, with the problem of bread. How to sustain life is the basic economic problem. All history has been shaped in response to this problem, the problem of man as a consumer.

The launching of the first co-operative was an empirical demonstration of this law. It was impossible for Marx to recognize the significance of the consumer co-operative because he failed to understand the basic law of Social Evolution,

The consumer co-operative attacked the bread problem for its members. It aimed to serve their immediate common needs. The harmony of interest of the majority controlled its actions.

To-day the consumer co-operative is the great economic phenomenon of the century. It constitutes a tremendous national and international power. Its members number into the millions and its annual turnover runs into the billions. No one to-day doubts that the consumer co-operative has made a profound impression on the capitalist system.

What we are interested in ascertaining at this

point is, has the consumer co-operative menaced the entire profit system or only certain factions of the capitalist class? An examination of the facts soon makes clear that thus far the consumer co-operative has held out its greatest menace only to that portion of the capitalist class that obtains a share of the Surplus Value extracted at the point of production by virtue of the part it plays as an intermediary between the producer and consumer.

The middlemen, the merchant class, the handlers of consumable wealth, is the class whose existence is endangered by the growth of the consumer co-operative. The share of Surplus Value which the producing capitalists hitherto have been compelled to give up to the merchant class now flows back into the pockets of consumers.

Marx's conception of the laws of Social Evolution made it impossible for him to conceive of a gradual elimination of commodity production under capitalist society. The production of use values under capitalism was to Marx unthinkable. How could the merchant be eliminated when he was nothing but "the agent of productive capital in the sphere of circulation"? (Marx.) The merchant class has certainly been lulled by Marx into a false sense of security. He gave it a lease of life equal to that of the producing capitalist group. It has every reason to regret Marx's fundamental errors. The millions that are annually taken from the merchants are to them a very painful reminder that Marx was mistaken.

What is the attitude of the producing capitalists—the owners of the means of production—toward the consumer co-operative?

The producing capitalist group has brought system and order into the sphere of production. The merchant class that undertook to dispose of the product, and thus help to realize more quickly the value contained therein, has done little to bring order and system into distribution. The anarchy and tremendous amount of waste in the sphere of circulation cuts deeply into the profit rate. The more time it takes to realize the value of the finished product the slower is the creation of value and Surplus Value. Consequently the producing capitalist group will gladly support any movement that will hasten the circulation of commodities.

It is the merchant class that is principally responsible for panics and collapse of industry. It buys not for a known market of consumers, but for a speculative market. The merchant is thus a hindrance to the development of industry.

The producing capitalist must therefore welcome any movement that promises to put the same order and system in distribution that it had itself brought into production.

This the consumer co-operative is in a measure accomplishing. It buys for a known market. It introduces a system into the circulation of commodities that is impossible under merchant distribution.

Another gain that the consumer co-operative

brings to the producing capitalist is an increased home market. The purchasing power of the members of the co-operatives is increased to the extent of the merchants' profit; an increase which makes itself felt in an accelerated circulation of commodities. There is still another advantage that must be noted. The increased purchasing power of the members of consumer co-operatives reflects itself in a generally improved physical and mental condition. This makes them better fitted for efficiency in production. Efficient production is impossible with a force that is physically and mentally below par. An improved social status of the workers invariably reacts to the benefit of the producing capitalists in that it makes possible an increase in the ratio of exploitation at the point of production.

Thus we learn once more that it is very much to the advantage of the profit system in production to eliminate the profit system in distribution.

But must the consumer co-operative limit itself forever to the handling of consumable products? Is it impossible for the consumer co-operative to attack profit at the point of production? The consumer co-operative activities cannot end with the handling of consumable wealth. The laws that brought the consumer co-operatives into existence will ultimately force them into the sphere of production. Indeed, a good beginning in this direction has already been made.

Let us now compare the consumer co-operative with the *practical* program of the Socialist Party

and with the changes that Social Evolution has brought about in the extension of the economic functions of the State.

We have seen that these three movements harmonize in that all concern themselves with the welfare of the consumer, with exploitation at the point of consumption. We have learned also that consumer concern is a phenomenon that is not peculiar to the present epoch, but is the universal law of Social Evolution.

The political success of the Socialist Party is due to the adoption of a consumer program empirically arrived at. The difference in the relative success of the Socialist Party and the consumer co-operative is explained by the fact that the consumer co-operative did not have to repudiate any theoretical principles in working out its practical program. The time that the Marxists spent in fighting each other over the inconsistency between their theory and practice, the members of the co-operative spent in building up their organizations and in extending their influence. Nothing else can explain the difference in the relative strength of the two movements.

We must now consider the relative merits of the consumer co-operative as the economic expression and the extension of the economic functions of the State as the political and social expression of the operations of the laws of Social Evolution.

Which offers the best means of attaining the goal towards which both are tending? Which is the more historic and, therefore, the more natural movement?

Which is likely to bring about the greater measure of social progress in a given time?

The unprecedented success of the consumer co-operative movement has fired the imagination of many noble men and women and warmed their hearts with its true social spirit. The democracy of the movement is an additional source of joy. They certainly have sufficient ground for their unbounded enthusiasm. Far be it from our purpose to detract one iota from the achievements and possibilities of the consumer co-operative. But what we should seek to ascertain is whether the movement is capable of attaining the goal our enthusiasts so hopefully predict for it. Is it within the power of the consumer co-operative to bring about a complete social transformation? If it does possess that power, which of the two movements operating towards that end is the more direct, the more certain and therefore the more efficient method of attaining the desired goal? Upon which movement shall we place the greater emphasis, the economic or the political?

There are very many good people who have lost faith in the political movement. It is not to be denied that there has been plenty of justification for this. The wrangling of the Marxists, the ever-recurring splitting up of the parties into innumerable factional groups, the tremendous loss of power that inevitably followed, prevented the Socialist parties from being the useful human agencies in the stimulation of Social Evolution that they might have been if they had understood the laws of Social Evolution

and thus had a scientific explanation for their practical activities.

As for the other agencies that are aiding in the work of extending the economic functions of the State in response to social interest, this aid coming from such unexpected sources and their motives being so inexplicable that though the activities are based on the same concern as the consumer co-operative, that is, the welfare of the consumer, the masses held aloof, for they had been told by the Marxists to suspect any action other than proletarian action, for the "economic interests of the owners of the means of production and the workers are diametrically opposed."

The only alternative then was the economic movement of the consumer on his own behalf through the consumer co-operative. The uninterrupted success of the movement, the harmony, unity and true comradeship that prevailed in striking contrast to the condition within the Socialist parties; all these seemed to indicate that here at last was *the* movement that would prove the most efficient and direct means of ushering in the social transformation. Does Social Evolution justify this belief? Has the consumer co-operative any limitations? If so, what are they?

In the first place, the consumer co-operative functions only for a portion of society. We have seen that all social wealth is the product of every useful member of society. It is society that produces all value and therefore all Surplus Value. If the merchant class that obtains a portion of this Surplus

Value from the original expropriators is expropriated, the portion of Surplus Value taken from it belongs to all useful members of society. When the consumer co-operative takes this portion and divides it exclusively among its own members, it distributes not what rightfully belongs to them, but has simply taken the Surplus Value from the merchant and given it to a privileged group. So far as society is concerned, it is still robbed of Surplus Value, the only change being in the number of the robbers. This is clearly brought out by the fact that non-members must pay full value at the consumer co-operative stores and obtain no dividends. The members furnished the merchants' capital instead of the merchant and participate in the merchants' profit instead of the merchant. Marx has analyzed in detail the proportion and rate of this profit in relation to productive capital.

The consumer co-operatives are therefore capitalist concerns, each member of which is a little "capitalist" exploiting society. We must recognize, of course, that the consumer co-operative does not seek to be a close corporation; its doors are thrown wide open to all. The consumer co-operative has a social ideal, but its methods must necessarily be capitalistic. It is well for those who claim that the consumer co-operatives are free from the taint of capitalism and that they stand for unalloyed democracy to bear these facts in mind.

The consumer co-operative is *not* the direct method of eliminating the capitalist system. It is, on the

contrary, a most devious method that is hedged in by innumerable inherent difficulties, most of which are insurmountable.

The first threat of the consumer co-operative is held out, as we have seen, against the merchant, both wholesale and retail. While historic conditions favor the co-operatives, nevertheless these organizations will not yield without putting up a stubborn resistance. They are powerfully entrenched and can make things mighty uncomfortable for the young and weak consumer co-operative that may be trying to obtain a foothold.

Then again, the extension of the consumer co-operative is automatically limited. We have seen that Social Evolution has forced the State to attack the capitalist system from four different "fronts": (1) social and industrial reform; (2) the elimination of the capitalist principle from transportation and communication; (3) direct taxation, and (4) distribution. The consumer co-operative has thus far been compelled to limit its activities to practically one field, distribution. The inherent nature of the co-operative is such as to make it best qualified to supply immediate and direct needs.

Railroads, telegraph, cable and telephone lines, electric, gas and water supply, etc., etc., are all beyond the reach of consumer co-operatives. Even export trade is more or less barred to the co-operative. It is evident that by its own unaided efforts the consumer co-operative could not possibly bring about a complete social transformation.

The well meaning enthusiasts who hold out such a possibility little realize the harm they bring to the cause of social progress. "Let us prove that we can do without the coercive power of the State," is their cry. "Let us do things for ourselves without asking or accepting aid from the State." Such doctrines as these tend to perpetuate the capitalist system rather than to undermine it. They glorify economic action and spurn politics.

These good people fail to realize the full significance of their teachings. They would probably be astounded to learn how thoroughly antisocial are the doctrines they preach.

They wish to accomplish things without the aid of the State. They prefer a civil war "between two portions of the people," as Marx and Kautsky predicted. While the latter expected that the civil war would be fought between the two portions grouped as producers against the owners of the means of production, the former group them as consumers against the handlers of consumable wealth, "a long-drawn-out civil war without battles or bloodshed." (Kautsky.)

Nothing could suit the capitalist class better than to have the slowly built-up confidence in political action which has at last been instilled into the masses suddenly broken down through the efforts of their own leaders.

To the war between the consumer co-operative and the merchant, the great mass of non-members must remain indifferent. It can be safely assumed

that the capitalist group will not prove such brainless idiots as to disdain to ask or accept aid from the State. On the contrary, they will leave nothing undone in an effort to obtain it. They will try to make it appear that their interests are identical with the interests of all who are outside of the co-operative membership.

Let us not forget that thus far the consumer co-operatives have been aided very largely by the fact that they have actually benefited producing capital, which is the basic and most powerful form of all capital. But when the time is reached for the consumer co-operative to begin a real invasion of the productive field things will not go so smoothly.

If the leaders of the consumer co-operative succeed in their propaganda against "asking or accepting aid from the State," if they wish to weaken their offensive and defensive powers by limiting themselves solely to the economic weapon, they will find themselves alone in a fight against powerful foes who will know how to make good use of the State; the weapon that the co-operatives were too short-sighted to lay hold of and use in their own interest.

The trade unions as the organization of producers have gone through all that. They disdained to make use of the power of the State. Experience has at last taught its bitter lesson, and to-day trade unions everywhere show a tendency to turn to political action as the true way out. On taking this step, they at once drop their antisocial character, or

rather confine it to its proper sphere, the point of production, and use their political power to champion their larger interests, their interests as citizens, social beings and consumers. Instead of separating themselves from the rest of society as is the case when they fight as trade unionists, they form a component of society with common social interests.

The experience of the consumer co-operative ought to bring a salutary lesson home to the leaders of this movement. This experience, instead of undermining their faith in political action, ought to arouse their enthusiasm for it as being after all the only social agency capable of steering directly towards the final goal.

If the economic consumer movement has done so well, how much better would the political consumer movement have done, is the question the leaders of the consumer co-operative ought constantly to keep before them.

When the political consumer movement compels the State to undertake an economic function we obtain a real transformation, the capitalist condition is done away with and the use condition takes its place. This economic function is forever lost to the capitalist class as a profit yielder. The Surplus Value cut off from the capitalist group that had been the recipient of it heretofore is not thereby merely transferred to another group, but is restored to society as a whole, whence it was originally taken.

There are yet other considerations that unerringly point to the political consumer movement as the all-

embracing and most direct means of bringing about the abolition of the capitalist system.

All economic functions must be financed. The leaders of the consumer co-operatives will readily assent to this. That has been their one great problem. The co-operatives were compelled to obtain their financial resources from the scant wages of their members. No other source was available. When society, on the other hand, is compelled by its citizenship to undertake an economic function, what happens? Society uses its power of direct taxation to take from the entire capitalist class a portion of the Surplus Value it had extracted from society. Society uses this capital for the purpose of expropriating a group of capitalists who live through profit.

Thus the capitalist class is compelled to furnish the money that is required in the process of undermining the capitalist system. By this method society kills two birds with one stone. Surely, the political consumer movement has some merits that should commend it to the consideration of the leaders of the economic consumer movement who boast that they refuse to ask or accept aid from the State.

Once the citizens in their organized capacity as the Government undertake an economic function, the combined capitalist class is helpless against it. If, on the other hand, the citizens should act on the advice of the consumer co-operator and leave the State in the hands of the capitalists, these will turn the State against its citizens and make it serve the interests of the capitalists.

The history of the past fifty years furnishes a continuous and unbroken record of organized society's attacks upon the profit system. Labor legislation, social legislation, assumption of economic functions, direct taxation, public education, public health service, etc., etc., each and all of these represents an attack upon the profit system.

The organized power of the State was put behind these attacks; therefore, they could not fail of success. Who has reason to fear and distrust the State, the capitalist class or the great body of consumers?

It must be remembered that heretofore Social Evolution has worked blindly, without a clear comprehension on the part of society as to whither it was tending. To-day we know the historic purpose of Social Evolution. To-day we know the historic function of the State as an instrument in the hands of Social Evolution. Political democracy has placed the control of the State in the hands of the people. The people must use the State as the only means of abolishing the old form of society and ushering in the new.

The Marxists fail to understand all this. They still talk of the capitalist State as if nothing had happened since Marx's time. They wish to abolish the capitalist State. They expect to abolish it through the efforts of the producers. They believe in political action, not as a means of using the State, but rather as a means of destroying the State. It must be a class movement. Such is their theory. In prac-

tice they make a complete shift and become a political consumer movement. This fatal inconsistency has paralyzed their activities, brought strife within their organizations and killed their usefulness as a constructive social agency.

The consumer co-operator, on the other hand, while consistent with Social Evolution in that he concerns himself with the welfare of the consumer, with consumable wealth, by his blind faith in the possibilities of consumer economic action and his distrust of political consumer action puts himself in the class with those who would obstruct the processes of Social Evolution.

If the Marxists had scientific principles as a basis for their consumer practical program, if the consumer co-operatives had a real appreciation of the inherent deficiencies and limitations of their economic movement; if these limitations had succeeded in convincing them that, after all, the political consumer movement alone is capable of working out the historic social transformation, and if as a result of this knowledge both of these movements in conjunction with the political parties of the trade union movement and the Non-Partisan League, representing the tillers of the soil, were to throw themselves behind the processes of Social Evolution, who can doubt the result? How social progress would bound forward in response to this great stimulus; how the social consciousness would go out to all these movements and for the first time bring harmony, order

and unity of action into conflicting movements having a common purpose.

We would then witness not a class struggle, not a civil war, not one portion of the people against another, but a conscious, united movement composed of every useful member of society using its organized power through the State against a class—the profit-making class. Such power would prove irresistible. The capitalist class would be compelled to give way like snow before the noonday sun. The profit-making class is fully conscious of the threat held out to it by the State. The capitalists know that the State possesses the necessary power to bring about their expropriation. Many avenues of profit-making have already been taken away and forever closed to them. The capitalists know their doom is sealed. Their only hope lies in delay. Nothing could please them better than to see their opponents divided. In a political democracy the State obeys the will of the majority. The majority is master, the State is servant. As long as the opponents of profit spend their time snarling at each other, capital has little to fear. Its lease of life is prolonged.

But it is impossible that the lessons of Social Evolution will be entirely lost upon those who are interested in accelerating its process. They are bound to learn its method and divine its purpose. The arrival of that day will witness a new era, a new hope will arise in the breast of man.

CHAPTER XV

WAR AS A FORCE IN SOCIAL EVOLUTION

PRIOR to July, 1914, before the bestialities of Hell were turned loose upon an unsuspecting world, there may have been found, here and there, an individual with atavistic tendencies who could condone war. But to the great majority comprising the international human family, the very thought of war was abhorrent. The Socialists very naturally shared this abhorrence in common with their fellows. But the humanitarian was not the only ground upon which Socialists based their opposition to war. "The Socialist opposition to war," says Hillquit, "is based not merely on humanitarian grounds, potent and compelling as these are, but principally on the deep-rooted conviction that modern wars are, at the bottom, sanguinary struggles for the commercial advantages of the possessing classes and that they are disastrous to the cause of the workers, their struggles and aspirations, their rights and liberties."¹ Now what is it that forms the basis for this deep-rooted conviction that wars are disastrous to the cause of the workers?

¹ *American Socialists and the War*, 1917.

The basis for this conviction is to be found in Marxian principles. Marxian principles teach that the laws of social progress operate through the class struggle. Whatever progress has thus far been attained is the fruit of years of slow, laborious operation of this conflict. War, say the Marxists, gives the capitalist class the welcomed opportunity of sweeping away at one blow the previous gains that cost the workers years of struggle and effort.

War must make for social retrogression; Marxian principles admit of no escape from this conclusion. Algernon Lee upbraids Joshua Wanhope for overlooking this fact. In a signed article, captioned, "Anti-Militarism: A Question of Principle or Only of Policy?" he says:

*It[war]is a vital question in its bearing upon the present interests and the future progress of our class. . . . If we believed that two or three years of world-wide war would put an end to class rule and usher in the co-operative commonwealth and the effective brotherhood of man, it would be our duty to do all in our power to bring about such a war, reckoning it a light price for the world to pay for permanent escape from class rule and exploitation. Now, if some party member sincerely holds such a crazy idea—and it is not out of all possibility that some do—is he free to go on the platform or use the public press for the propagation of that idea? Would it be grossly intolerant for the party to censure him, to call on him either to quit his advocacy of war or else to leave the party, and if he did neither, even to expel and publicly repudiate him?*¹ [My italics.]

Any man who wishes to remain within the Party must subscribe to the Marxian principle that social

¹ *New York Call*, January 6, 1917.

progress can only be attained through the class struggle and therefore nothing but retrogression can result from war.

We do not wish to be accused of presenting the views of but one faction of the Socialist Party. Louis B. Boudin is recognized as a Marxian scholar and revolutionary Socialist. What is his interpretation of Marxian principles in relation to war?

When the famous St. Louis Majority Report was brought in from committee, Boudin submitted a minority report, the second paragraph of which reads:

At the very outset we desire to declare our unalterable opposition to all wars declared and prosecuted by any ruling class, no matter what the ostensible purpose. *We believe that the interest of the great toiling masses cannot possibly be served by any such war.* And we particularly warn the workers against this snare and delusion of so-called defensive wars and wars for the alleged furtherance of democracy. [My italics.]

We thus see that the spokesmen of both wings are in complete accord as to the relation of war to social progress.

It may, however, be best to give the official position of the Socialist Party on this vital question. This is to be found in the Majority Report adopted by the St. Louis National Convention (1917) and ratified by a majority of the party membership. In this report we read that:

Wars bring wealth and power to the ruling classes, and suffering, death and demoralization to the workers. . . . The wars of

the contending national groups of capitalists are not the concern of the workers.

Has the World War borne out the conclusions that war must make for social retrogression? Where is there the Marxian scholar with the courage to affirm this? It surely would not be Hillquit. What a difference one short year can make! In July, 1917, we find him stating that "the Socialist opposition to wars is based principally on the deep-rooted conviction that they are disastrous to the cause of the workers," and one year later he tells us that:

One of the peculiar paradoxes of the war has been that *it has advanced the labor movement all over the world*. . . . Another great feature in this war *has advanced the labor and Socialist movements to the first place*—the natural instinctive democracy that the war has brought. . . . Another *great tendency in war times* which *strengthens the progressive labor movement all over the world* is the institution of collective ownership, management and control of industries which has been established in all civilized countries as a war measure. All these are not things desired or designed by anybody. They do not justify war. But they *explain why the indirect result of the war has been to strengthen the radical labor movement and the Socialist movement all over the world*.¹ [My italics.]

There is certainly considerable contrast in these two views. It is important to note, however, that the first is a deduction based on Marxian principles, whereas the second is but the recounting of historic facts.

Hillquit in no way repudiates the principles upon

¹ "Labor and the War," in the *Liberator*, July, 1918.

which he based his first conclusions. The social progress arising from the war he calls a *peculiar paradox*. Strengthening of the radical, labor and Socialist movement all over the world has been the *indirect* result of the war! And this is offered as a "scientific" explanation!

And Algernon Lee, whose Marxian conceptions led him in 1917 to proclaim that a man must be crazy to hold an idea that a social revolution could result from the war is to-day the principal speaker at meetings called together for the purpose of celebrating the revolutions in Russia, Germany and Hungary!

What about Louis Boudin? Oh, yes, we must not forget to note that he, too, is a perfectly consistent "Marxist." After stating in his minority report that "at the very outset we desire to declare our *unalterable opposition* to all wars declared and prosecuted by any ruling class, *no matter what the ostensible purpose*, (as) *we believe that the interest of the great toiling masses cannot possibly be served by any such war*," he brings in a resolution before the 1918 New York State convention which reads as follows:

We deem all demands for the withdrawal of troops of the United States from abroad *not in consonance with the principles of International Socialism or the policies of the International working class.* . . .¹ [My italics.]

Such is the consistency of the followers of the Marxian philosophy which they claim is founded upon the science and laws of Social Evolution.

¹ Louis Boudin, New York State Convention, 1918.

Let us now ascertain if Social Evolution is given to peculiar paradoxes and why it acted on the crazy idea of bringing about social revolutions by means of war.

What is war? War is a challenge to national existence. Vast national possessions that took hundreds and perhaps thousands of years to acquire may be snatched away by a victorious foe. The lives not only of its army but of the civil population are placed in serious jeopardy. *War brings a modern nation face to face with the basic problem of primitive man, the problem of existence.*

To meet the problem, primitive man used the weapons and methods that in his limited experience had proved most effective. It is hardly to be expected that modern nations would do less. War is a *social problem*. It is the social problem, the problem of existence. The nation throws in every resource available to it in an effort to successfully meet that problem. The people comprising a nation look to the Government they support to protect them against the menace to their existence. What does the Government do? War is a contest. Each opponent must study the methods and weapons of the other with a view not only of duplicating them, which only negatives the power of the opponent, but of superseding them and thus insuring a victory.

The opponent has placed an army in the field. It must be met with an army equally as large and larger. What is an army? An army is made up of

the best manhood of a nation, each member of which is expected to risk his life in the defense of that nation. On what principle is this demand based? On the principle that national interests supersede all personal interests. The interests of a group must become subservient to the interests of the majority. In war and in peace, this has been the ruling principle ever since man became a social being.

But in modern times the manhood of a nation constitutes but one element in the problem of national defense. Armies must be supplied with food, clothing and complex engines of destruction. The means of production that had been perfected in the effort to solve the problem of existence must, now that national existence is suddenly endangered, be driven to the utmost in an effort to overcome the imminent danger.

Intensity of production and distribution becomes the real test, the real war duel, with the prize of victory going to the nation that has obtained the best results.

Social processes must now evolve at an unprecedented speed. The rate at which they proceed in peace times in their purpose to solve the problem of existence would, in war times, make for national suicide. Social processes must, therefore, be speeded up. But the law that controls their operation is the same as in peace times. The harmony of interest of the majority as social beings always furnishes the basis for the operations of Social Evolution.

Modern wars are wars of nations rather than wars

of armies. As soon as war is declared, in response to the economic interests of the majority as social beings or consumers, organized society at once proceeds to concern itself with the problem of consumption. The army must be supplied first. The civilians must be supplied or they will not be able to support the army. Social Evolution forces organized society, through its government, to assume economic functions.

There are four great divisions to the economic functions of a nation: production, transportation, communication and distribution. Each of these in peace times has been developed through private effort on the profit principle. In war times the social interests of the majority demand intensification in all departments. What happens? Society proceeds to assume the economic functions of such departments as prove inadequate to meet the imminent problem of national existence. The first to be taken over are the means of transportation and communication. Why? Because in private hands they lack efficiency. Society, in self-protection, will not permit monopoly in private hands. But it is monopoly that makes for the elimination of waste and development of efficiency. Society, therefore, itself becomes the monopolist and takes over the means of transportation and communication.

Thus the social interests of the majority demand the elimination of the capitalist principle from these departments. The capitalists who owned these properties were compelled to yield up their immediate

interests when they conflicted with the social interests of the majority. Social Evolution concerned itself first with these functions because of their important relation to both production and distribution. Social Evolution does not operate violently. It seeks to attain its purpose without friction. The capitalists who were eliminated from control of a social function were nevertheless not expropriated entirely. Society guaranteed them the income of normal times.

The next function with which society concerned itself was that of distribution. Every item that enters into the daily needs of the consumer became a matter of social concern. How often one may eat meat, what kind and how many rolls one may have for breakfast, how many inches long one's coat may be, how many pockets may have flaps, etc., etc.; all of these become matters of social concern. In a word, distribution of consumable wealth became a national issue.

Next came production. How did Social Evolution, accelerated by the war emergency, deal with the capitalist mode of production? Was production taken out of private hands and socialized as were transportation, communication and distribution? Not at all. Why not? *Because the capitalist mode of production proved that it was not an outworn system of production.* On the contrary, it showed itself possessed of a tremendous amount of latent vitality. It proved responsive and equal to every demand that Social Evolution made upon it.

Here is something to ponder over for the Marxians who have been mouthing formulas Marx framed some seventy-five years ago. "The capitalist mode of production has outworn its usefulness and must be discarded," they thunder. And they make this claim in peace times. On all sides of them Social Evolution shows marked tendencies to concern itself with other departments of social relations. But they refuse to be lured from their monotonous chant, for they are scientific Socialists.

Yet when these "outworn" methods of production were put to the severest test in their history they proved that, far from outworn, they were capable of undreamed of expansion.

It is the capitalist mode of exchange and not the mode of production that proved itself outworn. And it did not require a world war to demonstrate this. Marx and Engels noted this fact when they wrote the *Communist Manifesto*. Crises and over-production are not to be charged to the capitalist mode of production, but to the capitalist mode of exchange. Marx and Engels because of their class struggle theory as the historic law of social progress could not separate the mode of exchange from the mode of production. The whole capitalist system must be overthrown at one time through the overthrow of the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, as far back as 1847 we find them saying that "for many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern *productive* forces against modern conditions

*of production.*¹ Yet Engels seemed to realize that it was the mode of exchange that was outworn and hampered the wheels of progress and not the mode of production.² The realization of the fact that *the mode of production rises in rebellion against the form of exchange* did not mean to him that Social Evolution would bring about an alteration in the mode of exchange; rather was it one more proof that the capitalist mode of production must soon be eliminated.

Were Engels living to-day, however, unlike present-day Marxians, he would hardly have retained that view. Marx and Engels were the masters, not the slaves of formulas. Shortly before his death, Engels recognized that both he and Marx had erred fundamentally.

History proved [said he] that we were wrong—we and those who, like us, in 1848 awaited the speedy success of the proletariat. It became perfectly clear that economic conditions all over the continent were by no means as yet sufficiently matured for superseding the capitalist organization of production. This was proved by the economic revolution which commenced on the continent of Europe in 1848, and developed in France, Austria-Hungary, Poland and recently also in Russia and made Germany into an industrial state of the first rank—all *on a capitalist basis, which shows that in 1848 the prevailing conditions were still capable of expansion.*³ [My italics.]

Engels, like Marx, was a student, and as such conformed his conclusions to the teachings of his-

¹ *Communist Manifesto*, p. 21.

² *Socialism Utopian and Scientific*, p. 138.

³ 1895 Preface to Marx's *Civil War in France*.

tory instead of seeking to conform history to his conclusions.

Marx¹ gave utterance to a great truth when he said that *one form of society never perishes before all the productive forces are evolved for which it is sufficiently comprehensive.*

Thus does Marx furnish present-day Marxians with a solution to the problem that has puzzled their brains as to why capitalist society still persists. The capitalist mode of production is far from exhausted. It is still capable of expansion. What it demands is better transportation and distribution. The possibilities of these as capitalist institutions have long been exhausted. It is therefore to the common interest of producing capital and society to bring about the socialization of these departments. Of all forms of capital, producing capital alone has not outlived its usefulness. It is still capable of advancing social progress and in consequence is the powerful element in society which, in combination with the useful, forms the majority necessary to set Social Evolution in motion.

When society assumes the economic functions of transportation, communication and distribution, the barrier which these have hitherto offered to production is removed. Crises and over-production become automatically abolished. Now all attention becomes focused upon production. Productive capital is for the first time compelled to answer the imperative historic question, "Can you fulfill social

¹ Preface—*A Contribution to the Criticism of Political Economy.*

needs? Can you solve the basic economic problem, the problem of existence, to the solution of which all social history has been devoted?" It is not *over*-production, but *under*-production, that compels a change in the conditions of production.

In the war through which we have just passed, social concern reached back to production by way of transportation and distribution. With these solved, but the needs still *unmet*, society for the first time was compelled to interfere in production. Society did not take over the function of production, but confined itself to dictating what should be produced. Needless duplication and wasteful methods were eliminated. Efficiency was furthered in every possible way. But beyond that production was not disturbed. On the contrary, unlike other forms of capital, productive capital made fabulous profits, because it came nearest to fulfilling social needs.

Society, nevertheless, reimbursed itself by raising the income tax rates to unprecedented proportions.

It is evident that Social Evolution is not governed by two different sets of laws: one for peace and one for war. It also becomes evident that war does not and cannot nullify the operations of Social Evolution that are manifest in times of peace. On the contrary, but one and the same set of laws control the operations of Social Evolution in peace as well as in war. There is a difference, but it is a difference of degree and not of method.

In war and in peace, the major economic problem,

the problem of existence, governs the operations of Social Evolution. In war and in peace, the social interests of the majority determine the operations of Social Evolution. In war and in peace, the development of national production is of common interest to the majority as social beings. In war and in peace, all modes of transportation and distribution that act as a check upon the development of production must, in the interest of the majority as social beings, be discarded and replaced by new and more efficient methods. In war and in peace when a mode of production freed from the handicapping influence of inefficient transportation and distribution, on reaching its maximum efficiency, demonstrates that it is incapable of solving the problem of national existence, the social interests of the majority demand that it be discarded and replaced by a more efficient mode of production. Such is the inexorable law of social change.

Present-day Marxians are not students, but blind worshippers of the past. When asked how is the tremendous rate of social progress following in the wake of the Great War to be explained they tell us: "It is a peculiar paradox"!

To the people of every nation involved, the World War brought home the lesson of the common social interest of all classes as against the opponent. All classes rallied to the defense of national existence. There was, however, one group in every nation that refused all aid to the common social problem. In the European countries this group consisted of a

small number of Left Wing, revolutionary Marxians. In the United States, opposition was the official stand of the Socialist Party. We have already quoted some of the official spokesmen in explanation of this. There is the humanitarian ground which is common to every normal human being. But the scientific ground was that the war would make for social retrogression. If they believed that the war—which succeeded in cementing all elements in society—would make for social progress, they would not on humanitarian grounds have withheld their support. The American Socialist Party makes this point quite clear. It states that “the only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression.”¹

This is the consistent Marxian position. Anti-social civil war is the only war sanctioned by Marxian principles. The opposition in the European countries took the identical position. Those Socialists who did come to the support of their respective nations were excoriated as traitors to the working class; “social patriots” who had repudiated Marxian principles. Marxian principles teach that social progress can only be attained through antisocial conflict. Therefore, a true Marxian can never give his support to a common social problem.

But the war did bring about social progress in every country. Nay, more than that, it actually

¹ Majority Report adopted by St. Louis (1917) Convention,

brought about a nice crop of revolutions that toppled over thrones and dynasties so swiftly that one could hardly follow their chronological order.

But did all this convey any meaning to Marxian scientific (!) Socialists? Let us see.

CHAPTER XVI

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

THE first throne to topple was that of his majesty, Nicholas II, Czar of all the Russias. Was this an accident or is there an historic explanation for this phenomenon?

War, as we have seen, is a social problem, the problem of national existence. The people rally to the support of their Government and put their possessions and their lives at its disposal to be used in defense of national existence. The backward Russian nation in a test of strength with a fully developed industrial nation like Germany was doomed to defeat. This outcome could not possibly have been avoided even if the Government were heart and soul with the people. But it is a well-known fact that the reactionary and corrupt Russian Government shamefully betrayed its people. The people were compelled to take over the prosecution of the war into their own hands.

They organized the resources of the nation and struggled to maintain an efficient and equipped army in the field. All classes were a unit in their determination to defend their national existence. Opposition

was met only from the two antisocial elements, the Czar's Government and the revolutionary Marxian Socialists. The Government, of course, was at that time the principal impediment to national security. National existence united all the people against the Government and the Government was abolished. It was a social revolution because it promoted the social interests of all classes in Russian society. Due to the fact that the majority of the people were behind it, the revolution was swift, sure and comparatively bloodless.

The Marxian scientific Socialists, like Lenine and Trotsky, had done nothing to bring about the revolution. Neither of them was in the country at the time. But their disciples did everything in their power to split the united people into class-warring groups. If they had succeeded, the revolution would have been defeated. The revolution of 1905 would have been successful if it hadn't been for the antisocial activities of the Marxians.

The people proceeded to create a constitutional form of government that was calculated to advance the social interests of the Russian people and place them in the first rank of democratic nations. Industrial development would have proceeded at an unprecedented rate, due to great natural resources and financial support from advanced nations. The road would have been quickly paved for the historic basis for social change.

But Messrs. Lenine and Trotsky were too scientific to understand all this. Didn't they learn from Marx

that the proletariat and the bourgeoisie had conflicting interests? Didn't Marx prove that labor creates all value and that all exploitation takes place at the point of production? Didn't he tell us that social progress is registered through the class struggle? The thing, therefore, for a true Marxian to do is to wage the class struggle against the exploiters. Through this struggle lies the road to progress. Away with the bourgeoisie, and the capitalist mode of production!

Marx,¹ of course, had said that *new or higher conditions of production never step on the scene before the material conditions of existence of the same have come to light out of the womb of the old society.*

But that was only an incidental statement written in a preface and therefore could not have much of an historic significance. Anyway, the great Marxians, Lenine and Trotsky, didn't pay the slightest attention to it. But the class struggle, ah! there is the heart and kernel of social history! Let us stick to the class struggle and we can't go wrong.

So, no sooner is the Russian social revolution an accomplished fact and bids fair to bring to that unhappy country a certain measure of social progress, than Messrs. Lenine and Trotsky arrive just in time to defeat this underhand plot. "We must have the class war and the dictatorship of the proletariat," they thunder. Down with the bourgeoisie; the wage worker alone creates all wealth; away with the rest!

Russia is now under the dictatorship of the pro-

¹ *A Contribution to the Criticism of Political Economy.* (My italics.)

letariat. The class war is raging. The civil war they had always dreamed of is gradually assuming the form of a nightmare. Civil war is a game two can play at! It remains to be seen which will conquer.

Lenine and Trotsky had always leveled their shafts of criticism against the other Marxians for their inconsistent and compromising ways. But how did Lenine and Trotsky attain their power and how have they maintained it? They succeeded in undermining the Kerensky Government because of their promise of immediate peace and bread. No sooner did they obtain power than they at once embarked upon a civil war which is growing in fury while the World War has come to an end. The proletariat of Russia is still waiting for the bread promised them by Lenine and Trotsky.

When the question of dealings with other nations came up, Trotsky¹ expressed himself in no uncertain terms. "It is impossible," he said, "even to discuss a Russo-American alliance. Socialist Russia can never place itself under obligations to capitalist America."

One year later, we read this headline: "The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic is preparing to do a business of \$1,500,000,000 with the United States!"²

Such is the consistent and uncompromising position of Lenine and Trotsky. To-day we witness the

¹ *New York Call*, March 20, 1918.

² *New York Call*, April 9, 1919.

spectacle of the official representative of the Soviet Government in this country dogging the footsteps of the capitalist-imperialists of America, the Exporting Manufacturers' Association, in an effort to establish trade relations.

It may be said, of course, that such compromise is unavoidable in the present international situation. Let us turn our attention then to Russia proper. Surely, here we will find a consistent, uncompromising position. How could it be otherwise?

Certainly no one can believe that Lenine and Trotsky are monsters who derive fiendish joy out of the murder of noble men and women whom but yesterday they called Comrades. No, Lenine and Trotsky were compelled to resort to murder because of their unflinching devotion to their principles. The opposing Comrades would have compromised with the bourgeoisie. It was the duty of Lenine and Trotsky to prevent a compromise, be the cost what it may. It is terrible to have to shoot down your Comrades, but to compromise with the bourgeoisie is a still greater crime. Lenine and Trotsky unhesitatingly chose the lesser of the two evils.

With the compromising Comrades conveniently out of the way, Lenine and Trotsky were free to put into effect their uncompromising principles. They proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie was completely excluded. Lenine and Trotsky were intoxicated with joy. The dream of their lives was at last realized. The price was high but justified by the results. The class struggle ended

in a complete victory for the proletariat. The industries now belong to the producers and they obtain "the full product of their toil."

Translated into practical achievements, what did all this spell for the workers? Collapse of industry, commercial chaos and starvation. Lenine and Trotsky had failed the masses. They had promised peace and bread; they brought neither peace nor bread. Dictatorship of the proletariat means starvation for the proletariat. Victory for uncompromising principles means industrial stagnation and disorganization.

Unfortunately, it is not theories but bread that sustains life. Lenine and Trotsky had to be taught this by bitter experience. They banqueted the masses on revolutionary speeches which, while they thrilled, failed to fill the stomach. The demand for bread grew louder and more insistent. The reign of the dictatorship of the proletariat was menaced by the proletariat. Something had to be done, and quickly, too. Lenine and Trotsky, who preferred to spill the blood of their Comrades, rather than compromise with the bourgeoisie, were compelled to turn to the bourgeoisie for help. Bitter experience had taught them a sober lesson. Lenine now tells us that:

Without the direction of specialists of different branches of knowledge, technique and experience the transformation toward Socialism is impossible. . . . But the specialists are inevitably bourgeois. . . . Although we have succeeded in defeating sabotage, we have not yet created an environment which would put at our disposal the

bourgeois specialist. . . . We were forced now to make use of the old bourgeois method and agree to a very high remuneration for the services of the biggest of the bourgeois specialists. . . . It is clear that the measure is a compromise.

Furthermore, it is clear that such a measure is not merely a *halt* in a certain part and to a certain degree of the *offensive against capitalism*, but also a *step backward by our Socialist Soviet State.*¹

Such is the graphic picture of “uncompromising” revolutionary Marxians in action. Oh, strange spectacle! The bourgeoisie practices sabotage and the “dictatorship of the proletariat” resents it!

To what degree have the practical lessons, as narrated by Lenin, influenced the theoretical position of these uncompromising Marxians? Theory that does not work out in practice cannot be very sound theory. Was this obvious truth recognized by these scientific Marxians? Let us investigate.

Lenin wrote *The Soviets at Work* after six or eight months’ practical experience as the leader of a State under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to retain power and prevent the starvation of the proletariat, he and Trotsky were compelled to compromise with the bourgeoisie. One year later they issued a call for a congress of the “New Revolutionary International.” Does this call seek to give the proletariat of the rest of the world the benefit of the practical experience in Russia? Does it aim to prevent in other countries a repetition of methods that, in practice, proved wholly Utopian?

¹ *The Soviets at Work.* (My italics.)

Is it its purpose to unite all Socialists rather than divide them? Is it conceived in a spirit that would indicate remorse for having uselessly murdered scores of good Comrades whose views experience had vindicated? Does it grasp the opportunity, in a measure, to atone for its crimes against these Comrades, by doing all in its power to prevent such fratricide in other countries?

Let the document speak for itself:

Dear Comrades: The undersigned parties and organizations consider it an urgent necessity that the first congress of the new revolutionary International be called. . . . The gigantic speed of the progress of the world revolution, that continually gives rise to ever-new problems, the danger of the choking of this revolution by that combination of the capitalist states, which, in opposition to the revolution, is rallying under the hypocritical flag of the League of Nations; *the attempt of the social traitorous parties to combine, so that after having declared "amnesty" to each other once more help their governments and their bourgeoisie to betray the working class;* finally *the hard-earned wealth of revolutionary experience and the internationalization of the whole revolutionary movement—all these circumstances* compel us to take the initiative to make the discussion of the question of calling an International Congress of the *revolutionary proletarian parties part of our business.*

As a basis for the new International, we deem necessary the recognition of the following clauses, which we shall consider *our platform*, and which have been worked out on the basis of the *program of the Spartacus Group in Germany and the Communist Party [Bolshevik] in Russia:*

1. The present is the period of dissolution and the collapse of the entire capitalist world system, which will mean the entire collapse of European culture, if capitalism with its unsolvable contradictions is not destroyed.

2. The problem of the proletariat consists in immediately seizing the power of the State. This seizure of the power of the State means the *destruction of the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie* and the organization of a new proletarian apparatus of power.

3. This new machine of State must embody the *dictatorship of the working class*, and in certain places also the small peasants and farm hands, *i.e.*, it must be the tool of the systematic overthrow of the *exploiting classes* and the means of their expropriation.

TYPE OF THE NEW STATE

Not the false bourgeois democracy—this hypocritical form of the rule of the finance oligarchy, with its purely formal equality, but the proletarian democracy and the possibility of the realization of *freedom for the working masses*; not parliamentarism, but self-government of these masses through their elected organizations; not capitalist bureaucracy, but organs of administration which have been created by the masses themselves, with the true participation of these masses in the government of the countries and in the activity of the Socialist structure—this should be the type of the proletarian state. *The power of the workers' councils and similar organizations is its concrete form.*

4. *The dictatorship of the proletariat* must be the lever of the immediate expropriation of capital and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, with its transformation into ownership by the people.

The main problems that confront us to-day are: (a) The socialization of the large industries and their central organization, the banks; (b) the confiscation of the lands of the great land-holders and the socialization of capitalist agricultural production.

(c) The monopolization of trade.

(d) The socialization of the great buildings and houses in the cities and on estates.

(f) The introduction of the *administration by the workers and the centralization of the economic functions in the hands of the organs of proletarian dictatorship*.

The term "socialization," as herein used, means the abolition of private property and its transfer to the ownership of the proletarian state and the Socialist administration of the working class.

5. For the purpose of safeguarding the Socialist revolution for defense against enemies within and without, of assistance for other national groups of the fighting proletariat, etc., *the complete disarmament of the bourgeoisie and their agents and the general arming of the proletariat is necessary*.

6. The fundamental means of the struggle are *mass action of the proletariat, even to armed open warfare with the State power of capital*.

RELATION TO THE "SOCIALIST PARTIES"

7. The old International parted into three main groups: First, those frankly social patriots who, during the entire imperialist war from 1914 to 1918 supported their bourgeoisie and transformed the working class into hangmen of the international revolution.

8. Then there is the "center," at present theoretically led by Kautsky and representing an organization of such elements, constantly wavering, not capable of following a definite plan of action and at times positively traitorous.

Finally the Left revolutionary wing.

9. As regards the social patriots, who everywhere in the critical moment oppose the proletarian revolution with force of arms, *only unsparing combat is possible*. As regards the "center," our tactics must be to separate the revolutionary elements and the pitiless criticism and unmasking of the leaders. . . .

10. On the other hand, a block with those elements of the revolutionary working class is necessary, which, although *they formerly did not belong to the Socialist parties now on the whole hold the views of and indorse the proletarian dictatorship in the form*

of the Soviet power. These are, *in the first place*, the Syndicalist element of the labor movement.¹ [My italics.]

So this is the platform of the new revolutionary International, as drawn up by those who had obtained most of the hard-earned wealth of revolutionary experience! What matters it that in practice they were compelled to repudiate its principles? Of what significance is the fact that the effort to enforce them in Russia paralyzed industry and brought nothing but starvation to the emancipated proletariat? Instead of encouraging the union of all Socialist forces they tell us that "only unsparing combat is possible." Well do we know what that means. The old, tried and battle-scarred veterans of perhaps a quarter of a century of unremitting toil in behalf of the masses are to be the first bloody victims of the "social revolution." Civil war must rage, the blood of the masses must pour like water, chaos must reign, the bourgeoisie must be crushed, and amid such a glorious environment the dictatorship of the proletariat proclaimed. All these are prerequisite preliminaries to the Social Revolution. Lacking these, progress is impossible.

Assuming that the Socialists of other countries act upon the advice of Lenin and Trotsky and, through blood, succeed in wading their way to the dictatorship of the proletariat, how are they to keep the masses from starving? Will they be obliged to do what Lenin and Trotsky were compelled to do; that is, compromise with the bourgeoisie? Will

¹ *New York Call*, March 20, 1919.

this prove any more difficult in other countries than it did in Russia? Let us for a moment follow the unsolvable contradictions of these uncompromising, revolutionary scientific Marxian Socialists.

First, they insisted that the bourgeoisie must be crushed and the dictatorship of the proletariat proclaimed, be the price what it may. Next, to retain power and prevent the starvation of the proletariat, they compromised with their bourgeoisie. Then, for the other countries they advise the repetition of their original tactics and this is followed a few months later with an appeal to the bourgeoisie of other countries to come to their rescue! This is evidenced by the following news item:

**CONFERENCE TO GET TECHNICAL AID FOR RUSSIA
—MARTENS CALLS GATHERING HERE TO SECURE
SPECIALISTS WILLING TO HELP SOVIETS¹**

Discussion of the problem of securing technical men to aid in the reconstruction of Soviet Russia will be the purpose of a conference to be called here for July 4-6 by L. C. A. K. Martens, Soviet Russian representative in this country.

The purpose of the conference will be to ascertain the number of technical men desiring to offer their abilities to Russia.

Difficult is the inheritance which fell to the share of the Soviet Government. Russia was devastated by the war . . . the railroads were in a state of paralysis, factories and shops remained without fuel and raw materials. Such was the condition of Russia when the Russian proletariat took the power into their hands. *At the first step they met with the sabotage of the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, which complicated the situation still more.* One of the principal tasks of the Socialist revolution in Russia

¹ New York Call, May 14, 1919. (My italics.)

is the creation of a new social system of a higher order than the capitalist system. . . .

The possibility of Socialism in Russia is determined by the measure of success with which the Soviet power is able to utilize the whole technical and organizing experience of capitalism for its own purposes.

It is, therefore, a very important task of the Soviet power to attract to the work in Russia experienced men in *the greatest possible number*, specialists in all fields of technology and science.

Here we have the naïve but somewhat belated recognition of Marx's fundamental proposition, *that new or higher conditions of production never step on to the scene before the material conditions of existence of the same have come to light out of the womb of the old society.*

Plachanov and the Mensheviks tried to remind Lenin and Trotsky of this truth, but they would not hear of it. They proceeded with their dogmatic task of first creating the higher conditions of production and expected these to fill the stomachs of the masses. Having learned a historic lesson at the expense of thousands of victims composed of members of the proletariat, whose dictatorship they established, Lenin and Trotsky must now proceed to create the material conditions of existence for their new social system. These scientists like a crab must crawl backwards.

But what would have been the plight of Messrs. Lenin and Trotsky if the proletariat of America had acted on their advice and also established the dictatorship of the proletariat? If the bourgeoisie resents the dictatorship of the proletariat, and this

resentment manifests itself in sabotage, what is the likelihood of the bourgeoisie of another country coming to the support of a proletarian dictatorship? And if all the countries had established the dictatorship of the proletariat at the one time—well, the competition for the services of the “useless” bourgeoisie would have been so keen that the dictatorship of the proletariat would soon have been converted into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie!

CHAPTER XVII

THE GERMAN REVOLUTION

THE historic explanation for the German revolution is, of course, identical with that of the Russian Revolution.

The autocratic German Government well knew that without the support of a majority of the German people it could not possibly wage a successful war. The masses, including the Socialists, were hoodwinked into the belief that national existence was threatened by Russia. This is biologically a conclusive argument which is bound to rally and cement all classes.

The Socialists justified their support of the war on two grounds: (1) They were siding with German progress as against Russian reaction; (2) If they failed to support the war, the German masses would turn against them. The latter statement constitutes a repudiation of the Marxian theory that the class struggle is the propelling force of social progress and an empiric acceptance of the law that social interests sway the action of the masses, overriding all class conflict.

Only an insignificant minority upheld the class struggle theory, the antisocial genesis of which

made participation in a matter of social concern an impossibility.

For four years the German people starved, suffered, bled and died in the interest of national existence. They gave money, treasure, life to their Government in the hope that through such unstinted support the Government would be put in a position to redeem its promise to protect national security.

The war was lost. The Government had failed the people. It had failed to protect the social interests of the majority. The social interests of the majority demanded that the Government which had proved itself inefficient be removed. It was removed. And what is the character of the Government that was put in its place? A Government representative of the social interests of the majority as democratically expressed by the electorate of the German nation.

Thus did autocracy in Germany come to an end. Not the class struggle, but the social interests of the majority brought about its doom. Inasmuch as this was a social revolution, the fact that it was accomplished without bloodshed should occasion no surprise.

The small group of Marxians, who by consistent adherence to the class-struggle theory had held aloof from the activities that created the historic conditions which alone made possible the social revolution, at once undertook to obstruct and, if possible, defeat the inexorable operations of the laws of Social Evolution.

They would have nothing to do with a social revolution. As uncompromising, revolutionary Marxians, they immediately demanded an antisocial revolution. "The class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is the true law of social progress! The only social revolution is the anti-social revolution. Such a revolution we are determined to bring about at once, be the cost what it may."

In an attempt to enforce such scientific principles on history, hundreds of loyal and devoted Comrades slayed each other with the ferocity of wild beasts.

Such noble souls as Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht fearlessly sacrificed their lives in behalf of a principle that is historically and scientifically false. Rosa Luxemburg little realized the misery that her theories, if enforced, would bring to the very class in whose interest she gladly gave her life. Her views had undergone no change whatsoever. In 1899 she wrote:

As, however, the cataclysm of the bourgeois society is the cornerstone of scientific Socialism so the removal of this cornerstone would logically lead to the breakdown of the entire Socialist conception. . . . Without the collapse of capitalism the expropriation of the capitalist class is impossible.¹ [My italics.]

Four years of agonizing war with its unprecedented fury and cruelty did not bring enough misery to the German masses; we must proceed at once to expropriate the capitalist class and thus make certain of

¹ *Sozial Reform oder Revolution*, p. 56. Quoted by V. Simkhovitch.

the collapse of capitalism. But the masses are also a part of bourgeois society and industrial collapse must lead to starvation for the masses. Let the Spartacan group halt long enough in their Utopian star-gazing to cast their eyes on the bitter realities in Russia. What failed of accomplishment in Germany was supremely successful in Russia. The collapse of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and—and—oh, glorious, thrilling, ecstasy—the dictatorship of the proletariat! Are the Russian masses happy? Do they bless the Marxian class-struggle theory of history—that is, if they had ever heard of it—how do they like getting the “full product of their toil” now that they have been completely emancipated from wage slavery?

If the Spartacan group had been successful in Germany we would by this time have had another Soviet representative in New York competing with the Russian Soviet for the services of the despised bourgeoisie! Non-compromising, revolutionary, Marxian, scientific Socialism in theory and in practice!

And yet these groups have the effrontery to find fault with the old Socialist parties!

CHAPTER XVIII

CONCLUSION

IT is quite evident that a search for the underlying causes that have led to the collapse of the International Socialist movement is not the simple task many Comrades have imagined. It has been the fashion to dismiss this rather unpleasant problem with the stereotyped statement that the incessant strife within the international movement was due to differences over policy and tactics.

Our study had brought out the fact that the problem is not as simple as all that. Comrades do not massacre each other in cold blood because they disagree as to policy and tactics. We have discovered that the root of the trouble lies far deeper. It is now clear that the irrepressible conflict must be traced back to differences over principles rather than over policy and tactics.

Our re-examination of Marxian principles revealed the fact that they are neither scientific nor Socialistic. Marxian principles are not based upon the laws of Social Evolution and therefore are not scientific. Marx's economic interpretation of history with its class-struggle theory is fundamentally an antisocial

conception of history. We have seen where Marx made his mistake. He dealt with effects, not causes, but mistook them for causes.

We now know that the propelling motive power behind all social progress is the quest for a solution to the problem of existence and that throughout history all social change has been registered in response to the social interests of the majority. The majority is usually formed through a combination of the powerful and the useful as against the remnants of the past and useless of the present. This is the social interpretation of history. Social Evolution compels economic evolution. Social Evolution gave rise to the several epochs through which man has evolved. Each epoch presented the phenomenon of a class struggle at the point of production peculiar to that epoch, but which gradually disappeared as Social Evolution evolved the succeeding epoch.

Marx believed that Social Evolution operates through the class struggle.

The International Socialist movement is based on his theory of the industrial conflict. It concerns itself with the welfare of the producer and demands the abolition of the capitalist mode of production.

The Socialists entered practical politics not because it was indicated by Marxian theoretical principles, but in spite of its clear repudiation of those principles.

The "true Marxists" were bitterly opposed to this step. But the party's final decision was tantamount to the bartering away of their Marxian principles in

return for the political support of the masses. This momentous decision once made could be rescinded only under pain of losing the support of the masses.

From that moment on, the Marxists paid homage to two masters—Marx and the masses. The masses are not interested in theories. To them it is the everyday practical problems of life that count. It was demanded that the Marxists devote their practical activities to championing the social interests, the consumer interests of the masses. So we have the anomalous spectacle of the Marxists holding fast to Marxian principles in theory but applying the principles of the masses in practice. The two are in complete contradiction of each other.

Marxian principles concern themselves with productive capital and with the interests of the producer, whereas the masses are swayed by their social welfare, their welfare as consumers. The International Socialist movement grew in proportion as it repudiated Marxian theory and followed the dictates of the masses.

But along with the growth of the movement grew the strife within the movement. The consistent Marxists refused to barter away their principles for votes. The growth of the movement could not reconcile them to the repudiation of Marxian principles. They wanted the growth to represent new converts to the theory of the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They insisted that the owners of the means of production and the masses could not possibly have any interests in common.

The practical programs of the Socialist parties with their immediate demand planks do not threaten exploitation at the point of production, but concern themselves with the social, the consumer welfare of the masses; therefore, consistent Marxians cannot endorse them, for they bear no relation to Marxian principles.

Our study, however, has disclosed the fact that Marxian principles are not scientific, for they are not based upon the laws of Social Evolution. His class-struggle theory is an antisocial theory and the International Socialist movement, which accepts Marxian principles as its theoretical foundation, is not a socialist but an anti-socialist movement.

But the practical program which the masses forced the Marxists to adopt is consistent with the laws of Social Evolution inasmuch as it concerns itself with social welfare, the welfare of consumers. This practical program converted the International Socialist movement into a consumer movement and, as a consequence, into a socialist movement. And it is identically against this practical socialist program that the Bolsheviks, Spartacists and Left Wing factions wage their bitter and relentless struggle.

Such is the hopeless chaos in which the International Socialist movement is plunged. And what is the cause of this tragic situation? The cause must be sought in the Marxists' repudiation of all that is great in Marx. Marx lived, toiled and suffered in the hope that he would prove by the force of example that there is only one scientific way of advancing

Socialism and that is by observing the daily operations of Social Evolution and co-operating with these tendencies. Marx never tired of reiterating this fundamental law.

In Brussels, where I was exiled by Guizot, I organized, together with Engels, W. Wolf and others, a German "Arbeiterbildungsverein" which still exists. We published at the same time a series of printed and lithographed pamphlets in which we criticized mercilessly that mixture of French-English Socialism or Communism with German philosophy which then formed the doctrine of the "Bund." Instead of that we postulated scientific insight in the economic structure of civil society as the only defensible theoretical basis of Socialism. We also explained in popular form that it is not a question of putting through some Utopian system, but of taking a conscious part in the process of social transformation which is going on before our very eyes. . . . In the manifesto written for workingmen I discarded all systems and put in their stead a critical insight into the conditions, progress and general results of the actual social movement.¹

Such was Marx's conception of the scientific method. But what is the method of his so-called disciples, the present-day Marxists? Do they take a conscious part in the process of social transformation which is going on before their very eyes? Not at all. They shrink from taking a conscious part in the daily social processes. Instead they devote all their energies to an activity which Marx characterized as Utopian, that is, trying to put through a new social system. That new system they used to call the Co-operative Commonwealth, but this name has now

¹ *Karl Marx*, by Herr Vogt. London, 1860. Pp. 35-42. Quoted by Simkhovitch. (My italics.)

gone out of style and the latest thing in systems is the Soviet Republic. No, *a critical insight into the conditions, progress and general results of the actual social movement* (Marx), may have been the scientific "style" in Marx's time, but styles will change and so the modern "scientific" style is to ignore the actual social movement and instead call for a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The would-be disciples of Marx are but a libel on Marx.

The Bolsheviks, the Spartacists and Left Wingers reverse Marx's procedure. They discard Marx's scientific method of basing propaganda on a critical insight into the actual social movement and instead base it on Marx's theoretical system. Their achievements in Russia and their efforts in Germany bear eloquent and bloody testimony to the scientific (?) character of their propaganda. These are but the fruition of the fundamental contradiction which forms the quicksand foundation for the International Socialist movement. The movement has lived a lie. The practical program fostered the belief that the movement aimed to promote social progress through social and democratic methods, but when the test came it proved itself in reality to be an antisocial, anti-democratic movement aiming at a dictatorship of a class. Socialism can only be attained, say they, through civil war, with all the agony, fratricide and misery that the word implies.

This much may be said for the Bolsheviks: they are consistent and therefore set themselves against

the double dealing which heretofore has been the policy of the International Socialist movement. In their call for the Third International, they expressly exclude all parties that owe their influence and growth to the empirically arrived at Socialist practical program. Instead they offer representation to all antisocial elements that always opposed the Socialist practical program. The Bolsheviks say that a block with those elements of the revolutionary working class is necessary which, although they *formerly did not belong to the Socialist parties, now on the whole hold views of and endorse the proletarian dictatorship in the form of the Soviet power.*

The Bolsheviks wish to remain true to the theoretical Marxian principles and apply them in practice. These principles, however, are Utopian. They seek to bring about a new social system by force without consideration to the laws of Social Evolution. The Bolsheviks must fail unless they reverse themselves and adopt a social democratic program, and repudiate their antisocial class-struggle principles.

What is to be the experience in other countries? Will the Marxists of each country have to learn of the Utopian character of their principles only at the expense of bloodshed? Must light come to them only through the darkness and misery which the practical application of their principles bring to the masses? Leaders and teachers of the International Socialist movement, what is your answer? Every drop of blood uselessly spilt will be an indelible stain

on your conscience. Upon your heads must rest the guilt for the bestial slaughter which the practical application of your principles always engenders. Unlike yourselves, your disciples are in the main consistent. They wish to conform practice to theory. And so they get out of your control. They go to the Left while you, lacking the courage of your convictions, veer to the Right. You are consistent in your inconsistency. With you, theory is one thing, practice quite another.

But this miserable situation has now come to a head. It can be dodged no longer. You must either repudiate your teachings or repudiate your practice. Your straddling attitude has earned for you the well-merited contempt and hatred of your disciples.

The Marxists claim to be the only true Socialist group in society. All experience, however, points to the very opposite—that they are an antisocial group in society. They are opposed to the use of the State as a social instrument. They wish to “capture” the State so that they might destroy it. They despise the “bourgeois” State. But the bourgeois does not despise it. On the contrary, he finds it a very handy instrument. He is only too happy to keep it on his side. It delights him to know that the Marxians do not threaten to take the control of the State from him and then use it against him. The capitalist fears the power of the State. That is why he feels safe only when it is under his control. Should the Marxists attempt to put their antisocial principles into practice, should they decide to cap-

ture the State through other than political methods, it will certainly be a great comfort to the capitalist class to know that the power of the police, the militia and the courts are all on its side.

But the Marxists disdain to learn a lesson from the capitalist class. They refuse to make use of the State as the tool by means of which to undermine profit. That would be a social process and therefore does not square with their antisocial principles. Besides, it would mean nothing but slow, plodding work, without any of the revolutionary thrills evoked by calls for the *dictatorship of the proletariat, revolutionary mass action, militant proletariat, the emancipation of the masses from the thraldom of wage slavery, the class struggle against their exploiters*, and all the other brave words that are guaranteed to bring down the house. How could it be possible to attain progress without such indispensable tools? They are fundamental to social progress. From the attitude of the Marxists, one is forced to the conclusion that to them form is more vital than substance. Social progress is to them an intoxicating game with the lives and well-being of the masses a minor consideration.

In every country there are to be found political or social organizations which, while making no pretense that social democracy is their aim, yet undertake activities in harmony with the spirit and purpose of socialist organizations.

They devote themselves usually to a number of measures that aim to serve the social and consumer

interests of the people as a whole. They demand that the people through their Government take over some economic function, and this, of course, makes for the elimination of the capitalist principle—profit—and replaces it with the socialist principle—service.

What attitude do Marxians take towards these organizations? It is either one of indifference or actual hostility. Let us cite a few examples furnished by different countries.

We have already referred to the Reconstruction program of the British Labor Party. This program, although the product of an economic organization of the workers, is fundamentally a socialist program. The British Labor Party is not a Marxian party and therein lies the hope of the British masses. The program spurns all class appeal, but lays great stress on the social and consumer welfare of the people. This program does not aim to destroy the State, but to destroy the profit system through the State.

If the British Socialist Party, a Simon-pure Marxian organization, had gotten control of the British Labor Party, what would have been the result? The antisocial class struggle would have become the central theme of the reconstruction program. Economic interests rather than social interests would have been stressed. And the British Labor Party would have taken its place beside the British Socialist Party, unnoticed and unheard. But fortunately for the British masses it is the non-Marxian Fabian Society that has the ear of the

British Labor Party and has played an important part in the framing of the Reconstruction program. This historic document is in harmony with the operations of the laws of Social Evolution and is therefore scientific.

If the future policy of the British Labor Party remains free from the influence of the Marxian, revolutionary scientific Socialists, its social purpose will crystallize in undreamed of blessings for the masses. The British Labor Party will make the distribution of consumable wealth its first concern. It will not cater to the workers as workers, but to the life needs of the workers. It will demand that the British people solve their common problem of existence through the agency of their Government. The people through their Government will abolish the profit principle in those departments where inefficiency is most glaring, *i.e.*, in distribution of consumable wealth. This is the department that is closest to the life of the people, and the British Labor Party will see to it that it is placed in the hands of the people.

With the profit principle eliminated from transportation and distribution will come the test of the profit principle in production. When the private owners of the means of production will no longer be in a position to claim *over*-production then will the people be in a position to claim *under*-production as the cause of want in the means of life. This stage will mark the beginning of the end. The British people will thereupon abolish the proven

inefficient profit principle in production and replace it with the social principle—serving the life needs of the nation. Thus will the capitalist system with its classes and class struggles disappear from British soil.

There is only one factor that can prevent England from being one of the first genuine Socialist countries, and that is the Marxian revolutionary scientific Socialist. This scientific group, in spite of the teachings of Social Evolution, still insists that social progress must be the result of a class struggle waged by producers instead of a social struggle against a class waged by consumers. The economic antisocial class war is bound to have a reactionary influence. Nothing could suit the capitalist class better than an economic conflict with the State in the hands of the capitalists. It means a betrayal of the hopes and aspirations of the workers. It means the horrors of Bolshevism duplicated in England. It means brutal civil warfare with the workers drowning in each other's blood. Such would be the inevitable result were the Marxists to obtain leadership over the British masses. As between the Marxists and the British Labor Party, could there be a doubt as to which would enlist the support of Marx?

The Marxists hurl the taunt of "social patriots" at all elements that come to the support of their national existence. The Marxists are safe from a like accusation. Social patriotism means loyalty to society, whereas the Marxists are antisocial. The hope of the masses is bound up with the social

patriots' loyalty to society. Social patriotism makes for a social system based upon social service. God speed to the social patriots.

In Germany the Marxists have thus far failed to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Democracy, having dethroned the old form of autocracy, seems sufficiently virile to withstand an attack from the new.

With the Spartacide menace apparently over, what is the outlook for democratic Socialism in Germany?

Barring a coup d'état from either the Junker or Spartacide camp, which would plunge Germany into the whirlpool of civil war, all signs point strongly to Germany as the first Social Democracy. More than that. Not only is Germany likely to be the first country to develop democratic Socialism, but it will profoundly stimulate the development of democratic Socialism in other countries.

What is the basis for this admittedly dogmatic assertion?

For more than four years the German people gave up life and treasure in an effort to save their national existence. The men died on the battle-fields, the women and children starved at home. While it was the Kaiser who made the war, it was the people who suffered the horrors of the war. The Kaiser lost the war and was compelled to flee for his life.

Democratic Germany signed the treaty of peace and has pledged to pay for the Kaiser's war. The indemnity Germany will have to pay is beyond

calculation. Never in the world's history have indemnities been measured in such figures.

Even before the war, with Germany at her best in virile man-power and accumulated wealth, the sum would have appeared staggering. But to-day, with the best and fittest in the land lying in premature graves, with those remaining in an emaciated state, with national wealth depleted, how can Germany meet this stupendous bill?

Germany will pay. She will meet her installments promptly. She will exert herself to the utmost in an effort to wipe out her debt in the shortest possible time.

The eyes of the German people are firmly fixed on their pre-war standard of national existence. They will leave nothing undone in an effort to regain it. And they wish to regain it in the shortest possible time. This means work. It means intensive work. It means efficient work. Germany will organize and systematize. She will prevent waste. She will prevent useless duplication. She will reduce non-productive labor to a minimum. In a word, Germany will stimulate wealth production to an unprecedented degree. The new Germany will become the most efficient nation in the world. There is no escape. The interests of the majority as social beings demand it. And it will be done.

The German nation will nurture its human resources as never before. Social and labor legislation will set a new standard. The wasteful and inefficient profit principle in the transportation and distribu-

tion of consumable wealth will be abolished and become a social concern. Every department based upon the capitalist principle acting as a fetter to production will be socialized. In order to be able to assume all these economic functions the German nation will resort to direct taxation on a scale beyond anything ever known.

And then what? Production is still in private hands. Yes, but it will be threatened. And the threat will come not from the native proletariat, but from the foreign bourgeoisie. The indemnity demanded by the Allies is so huge that even after the elimination of the inefficient profit principle in all other departments, wealth production will still be behind social need. For the German nation must now produce for the Allies as well as for herself. *Under*-protection will be a threat to the capitalist mode of production. The social interests of the majority will demand greater efficiency in production. The Government will begin by making a study of production with a view to suggesting improvements. This will be followed by regulation of production. The Government will dictate what should be produced and how to produce it. From this stage to complete social ownership is but a step. The last payments of the indemnity will in all probability be made by a Government representing a pure Social Democracy. The capitalists' governments of the Allies will have abolished capitalism in Germany. Democratic Socialism will become an established fact in Germany in spite of all opposition on

the part of the Marxian revolutionary scientific Socialists.

It will be the hated, social patriots who will do everything in their power to accelerate the social process in the interest of society.

In the meantime, what will be the happenings in the Allied countries, particularly England and the United States? We have already spoken of England. The British Labor Party will write new pages into English history. And the English capitalist will help.

The greatly increased efficiency which is bound to be the outstanding phenomenon of new Germany will compel the capitalists of England to seek the assistance of their Government in an effort to compete. The English Government will extent its social and labor legislation in order to promote the efficiency of the workers. Transportation and distribution will be socialized because productive capital and social interests will require it. The profit principle in production will as usual be the last to be dethroned. England will, in all probability, be the second nation to develop into a full-fledged Social Democracy.

What does the future hold in store for our own country?

The entrance of the United States into the world war sounded the death knell of American capitalism. Never in its history has the American Government concerned itself with economic and social functions as it does to-day. Social interests demand it, and the Government must respond to social interests.

The war needs have stimulated the productive forces a thousandfold. The owners of the means of production were no longer creating commodities, but use values. The capitalists were no longer hampered in the development of their productive potentialities for lack a of market. The people, through their Government, guaranteed to take all that the capitalists could produce. And how production responded to the creation of use values! Productive capital was delighted to drop the wasteful and inefficient middleman, broker, trader, merchant, and see him replaced by the Government. Transportation, communication and all functions bearing upon production and distribution were made efficient instruments of social service rather than creators of private profit.

The war is over. The displaced capitalist elements are raising heaven and earth in an effort to get back into the saddle. They wish to restore the inefficient profit principle which the social needs of the war had exposed and discarded. Will they succeed? Yes, for this antisocial element is organized and united, whereas the social elements are disorganized and divided. True to their antisocial class-struggle theory, the Marxists are not lifting a finger in an effort to stay the hand of reaction. That society is in danger of again being exploited by the profit principle in the means of transportation, communication and distribution is a matter of small concern to the Marxists. Their sole interest is the class struggle at the point of production. They are not

interested in social exploitation; they wish to abolish exploitation of the *producer* through a dictatorship of the proletariat.

But what is the attitude of these producers of whose welfare the Marxists are so solicitous? With them exploitation is no theory, but one of the daily facts of life. How do they propose to abolish exploitation? through the class war and the establishment of their own dictatorship? Not at all. They leave this method to the Marxists. In contrast to the Marxists' position, the producers demand that *social* exploitation be permanently abolished through *social* retention of the ownership and control of the means of transportation and communication. The railway unions demand the *social* ownership of the railroads, the Telegraphers' Union demands the *social* ownership of the wire systems, and the sentiment of the American Federation of Labor is strongly in favor of both these demands. These are strictly socialist demands, voiced by economic organizations that have failed to be influenced by Marrian dogma.

The Farmers' National Council also comes out in favor of these demands. Nevertheless, the railroads and wire systems will in all probability go back into private hands, to the joy of the antisocial elements. But their joy will be short-lived. Before another five years are over the railroads, the wire systems and the coal mines will be socialized. And they will be socialized in response to the social demands of peace.

The war has intensified production. Productive capital will not be satisfied to curtail production to the pre-war limits. It will make every effort to retain its wartime standard of efficiency. This natural ambition on the part of productive capital constitutes a menace to the private ownership of the means of transportation and communication as well as to the private ownership of the coal mines.

Productive capital will seek to compete with the intensified efficiency of new Germany and will have to have efficiency in transportation, communication and distribution. This efficiency only socialization can offer; therefore, society in response to the social interests of the majority will again eliminate the profit principle in the means of transportation, communication and distribution.

Social Evolution clearly indicates that the next five years will see society permanently emancipated from the exploitation to which the owners of the means of transportation, communication and distribution now subject it.

What role will the Marxists play in this historic process? Will their principles be the result of the application of Marx's scientific method of *a critical insight into the actual social movement*, or will they continue to resort to *an empty-headed and conscienceless play with propaganda*? The issue can no longer be dodged. The time for the test has arrived. The Socialist Party must *prove* its claim that it is a scientific and a socialist Party.

The Left Wing movement is a challenge to the

Socialist Party. It cannot be ignored. It demands that the Socialist Party repudiate its practical program which is inconsistent with Marxian principles. The Left Wing insists that the Socialist Party serve but one master—the theoretical principles based on Marxian conclusions. Does the Socialist Party dare repudiate the principles of the *Left Wing Manifesto*? Does the Socialist Party dare repudiate the principle of a proletarian dictatorship? What is the attitude of the Socialist Party towards the Left Wing principle that *Revolutionary Socialism does not intend to and cannot use the bourgeois state as a means of introducing Socialism; the bourgeois state must be destroyed by the mass action of the revolutionary proletariat*. Does the Socialist Party indorse the civil war principle implied in that statement? If the Socialist Party accepts and indorses these principles, it must act favorably on the demand of the *Left Wing Manifesto*, that *all reform planks contained in the Socialist Party platform be abolished*. It must also heed the demand “that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policy and tactics above mentioned.”

The principles of the *Left Wing Manifesto* are based upon Marxian principles. To repudiate the *Left Wing Manifesto* is to repudiate Marxian principles. Most Socialist teachers and editors indorse the *Left Wing Manifesto*.

A statement carrying thirteen signatures has recently been issued to the Socialist Party membership. The statement reads in part:

The members of the American Socialist Party are face to face with a national and international crisis. We who sign this letter believe that the time has come for the party to restate its principles and reformulate its tactics. As a basis for discussion for the purpose of bringing about this result, we present the following suggestions:

1. We believe in a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms, both local and national and *abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.*
2. We believe that the party must teach, propagate and agitate *exclusively for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of an industrial democracy.*
3. A political party cannot organize the workers on the economic field, but we believe that the party should assist this process of organization by a propaganda for revolutionary unionism as part of its general activities.
4. We believe that Socialist candidates elected to office *should adhere strictly to the above principles under penalty of recall.*
6. We believe that the party *should publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above mentioned.*
8. We believe that the Socialist Party should elect delegates to participate in any international congress to be attended by representatives of revolutionary Socialist parties of all countries, but that the party *should refuse to participate in any conference called by "Moderate Socialists" and "Social Patriots."* [My italics.]

And now who are these master minds who believe that they are Socialists and scientific Socialists at that? Why, most of the signatures are those of the leading teachers and editors in the Socialist Party! They have helped to write much of the literature which they have now come to believe ought to be discarded. Who could better judge of its merit? They have written Socialist Party platforms in which

social reform planks received first consideration; they received nominations and courted election with these reform planks as an issue, but now they tell us that all this was sheer camouflage. The business of the Socialist Party is to overthrow capitalism. The business of a Socialist assemblyman or alderman is to bring in a resolution for a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Social reforms concern themselves with the welfare of the consumer, hence can have nothing in common with scientific Socialism and no Socialist who wishes to be considered scientific can consistently support social reforms! These scientists will have nothing to do with "moderate Socialists" or *social patriots*. As "scientific" Socialists the very word *social* is jarring to their revolutionary ears. But they are willing to join the Bolsheviks and the Spartacists in a civil war and the dictatorship of the proletariat. And yet many of them claim to be pacifists!

Moreover, as students and teachers, they know that to be a scientific Socialist consists in worshipping conclusions formulated some three-quarters of a century ago. They need not bother studying the operations of Social Evolution. All they need to do is to memorize formulas and they are sure to be "scientific Socialists." That, to be sure, was Marx's conception of Scientific Socialism!

The class-struggle theory has enslaved some of the greatest and noblest of spirits. Even so gentle and sublime a soul as 'Gene Debs is claimed as a victim.

Since his imprisonment, extracts of his speeches and writings have been quoted daily. We give some of them:

It is not to reform the evils of the day, but to abolish the social system that produces them that the Socialist Party is organized. It is the party not of reforms, but of revolution. . . . Steadily the number of class conscious toilers is increasing and higher and higher rises the tide that is to sweep away the barriers to progress and civilization. Let others talk about the tariff and finance—the enlightened workers demand the ownership of the tools of industry and they are building up the Socialist Party as a means of getting them.

The working class alone made the tools, the working class alone can use them, and the working class must therefore own them.

This is the revolutionary demand of the Socialist movement.¹

The italics are not mine, but appeared in the *Call*. Whether the editor or Debs is responsible for them is uncertain.

Several days later we read this statement:

The primal need of the working class is education. By education I mean revolutionary education, the kind that enables men to see that the twenty-odd millions of wage-earners in the United States are wage slaves; that the economic interests of these many millions of human beings who do *all the useful work and produce all the wealth* are absolutely identical; that they must unite; that they must act together, that they must assert their collective power.² . . . [My italics.]

In another quotation from Debs we find the following:

You [meaning, of course, the working class] have made all the marvelous machines. . . . But these large grown tools made by

¹ New York *Call*, May 8, 1919.

² New York *Call*, May 12, 1919.

labor and used by labor are not owned by labor. . . . Has it ever occurred to you workingmen that if you could make these tools and use them, you also can own them and produce wealth in plenty for yourselves?

Debs offers these statements in the name of scientific Socialism and the Socialist Party's official organ reprints them with approval. They form the basis for the class-struggle theory. *The working class alone made the tools, the working class alone can use them and the working class must therefore own them. This is the revolutionary demand of the Socialist movement.* Debs makes clear that by *working class* he means *the twenty-odd millions of wage workers . . . who do all the useful work and produce all the wealth.*

Socialism, then, is a class movement in the interest of a class. The *enlightened workers demand the ownership of the tools of industry and they are building up the Socialist Party as a means of getting them.* Thus does Debs join Lenin and Trotsky in their conception of Socialism and in their appeal to the working class. Yet Marx assured us that the proletarian movement is a movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority! If the workers of this country were to accept Debs' teachings, what would be the result? The horrors of Russia would be duplicated in this country. Civil war would rage. The twenty-odd millions of wage-earners would pit themselves against the eighty-odd millions who constitute the major portion of the population of this country. Can you picture, gentle 'Gene, the scenes that would ensue? Cast your eyes

upon Russia. See how Comrade cuts down Comrade. Observe those gushing rivers of red. Whence comes that blood? It is the life fluid of your Comrades and my Comrades, dear 'Gene. It is the blood of the masses in whose interest you have consecrated your life. I know your spiritual soul too well not to know that you would consider it a God-ordained privilege to lay down your life if by that act you could prevent the useless shedding of one drop of blood. And it is not alone proletarian blood you are opposed to spilling. You would far rather sustain a personal injury than knowingly crush out the life of the meanest earthworm.

Could there remain a light in your soul and a smile on your lips, dear 'Gene, were you convinced that agony and blood *must* be the prelude to Socialism? What would be your feelings, if the wage workers, accepting your teachings, should through a successful class war, wade their way to the ownership of the tools of industry? They would call that Socialism. And they could point to your teachings in proof of their claim. Tell us, 'Gene Debs, do you really want the wage workers to believe that Socialism means class ownership?

Another of your statements was reprinted, in which you say:

Ownership of the means of life of one class by another class, such as we have in the United States and in every other capitalist nation on earth means *class rule and class war, class supremacy and class subjection*.¹

¹ *New York Call*, June 18, 1919.

Here you refer, of course, to capitalist class ownership. But does that principle apply *only* to the capitalist class? Would you take exception to the statement: *Ownership of the means of life of one class by another class means class rule and class war, class supremacy and class subjection?*

To know you for but a single hour is to know that every fiber of your being rebels against the principle of class rule, no matter what the class. You are not a classist, you are a Socialist. If any proof were necessary it is to be had in the last paragraph of your statement from which the above was quoted. There you say:

We, the people, must own, control, regulate and manage industry, the means of our common life, so that we shall all have a chance to work, enjoy the fruit of our labor, have leisure time for recreation and the pursuit of happiness, and live the lives of civilized human beings.

We, as Socialists, know the thrill that came to you as you penned or spoke those words. You wish to see that blessed condition brought about as speedily and as peaceably as possible, do you not, gentle 'Gene? Which is likely to prove more successful in both these aims, your class-struggle appeal, an appeal to the *twenty-odd million wage workers* to demand the ownership of the tools of industry or your social appeal: *We, the people, must own, control, regulate and manage industry, the means of our common life?*

Why these conflicting appeals? Think what the

class-struggle appeal may mean for the wage workers. You speak to twenty millions of them, but you know that if you could succeed in converting five million you will have done well. These five million *revolutionists* would attempt to obtain for themselves the ownership of the means of life indispensable to society as a whole.

You, no doubt, had no other than legal methods in mind as the means of obtaining control of industry. But the Bolsheviks, the Spartacists and Left Wingers of this country, who claim you as one of them, have no use for parliamentarism; they do not believe it is possible to use the State; they therefore wish to destroy the State. They will imbue the five million *revolutionary proletariat* with this spirit. Is it necessary to dilate further upon the consequences? Assuming that the *revolutionary proletariat* should succeed in obtaining the upper hand, would you go to them and say, "When I said, *the twenty-odd millions of wage workers demand the ownership of the tools of industry, I did not mean that the twenty-odd millions of wage workers demand the ownership of the tools of industry.* I meant something entirely different. What I meant was, *We, the people, must own, control, regulate and manage industry, the means of our common life.*"

How would this statement of yours be received? Wouldn't the now victorious revolutionary proletariat be justified in asking some pertinent questions? They would ask, *Didn't you tell us that ours was a class struggle? Didn't you appeal to our class con-*

sciousness? Didn't you say that inasmuch as we wage workers do all the useful work and produce all the wealth we ought to own the means of production and produce wealth in plenty for ourselves? Didn't you say this was the revolutionary demand of the Socialist Party? Why, then, do you now say, *The people must own, control and manage industry?* Do you propose to defeat the aim of the revolution? Are you a counter revolutionist?

And would not the workers be justified in this line of questioning? How is it possible to justify the class-struggle appeal, when the ultimate aim of Socialism is that *the people must own, control, regulate and manage industry, the means of our common life?*

Be the motive what it may, the advocate of the class struggle is both an enemy of society and an enemy of the proletariat. He sets society and the proletariat to warring at one another. The proletariat is asked to obtain the mastery over society. This means civil war, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. When all this is accomplished, what must follow? Why, then, the proletariat is expected to return to society what it had taken from society! Or is the proletarian supposed to play the role of the valiant gladiator coming to the defense of society against its oppressors, the capitalist class? Society is helpless, the proletariat must wage a class struggle, in the interest of society. Society, however, doesn't know what's good for it and is bitterly opposed to a dictatorship of the proletariat. It actually resorts to armed opposition. Pshaw, society hardly deserves

the sacrifices the proletariat expects to make in its behalf.

But why can't society accomplish its own emancipation? It can, and it will. Why can't the proletariat co-operate with society to their mutual advantage? The proletariat *is* co-operating with society. The only element that refuses to co-operate with society is the misnamed *Socialist* element, the element that insists on a class war. Fortunately for society and the proletariat, the vast majority of the proletariat rejects class consciousness as a means of progress and feels instinctively that in social consciousness lies its hope.

The proletariat turns its back on the so-called Socialist Party and launches a Farmer Labor Party, but which in reality is a socialist Party, because its basis is not a class struggle, but a social struggle against a class. Its social appeal will attract hosts of supporters.

The farmers refuse to join the Socialist Party, but form the Non-Partisan League. Here, too, the appeal is made along social lines.

Another political party is in the process of formation. Noble men and women of all strata in society see the need for a true socialist party in this country. Many sponsors for this movement were formerly Socialist Party members. When its antisocial principles came to the surface they found themselves out of their element and were compelled to leave.

To whom will the Socialist Party cater? There can be little doubt that the Farmer Labor Party,

the Non-Partisan League and the new social movement will fuse into one national party. They will seek to serve the social interests of the majority as consumers. They will appeal to the social patriotism of the people. Will the Socialist Party meet this appeal with a call to the class conflict at the point of production? The new party will appeal to the soldier vote on the principle of making our country safe for democracy. Will the Socialist Party answer this with an appeal for a dictatorship of the proletariat?

The new party will appeal to the woman vote with the demand for social assumption of the distribution of consumable wealth. Municipal ice, coal, milk, etc., will make a powerful appeal to the woman vote. Will the Socialist Party meet this appeal with the statement that the worker is exploited only at the point of production?

One of the most prominent women labor leaders of Great Britain says:

It may surprise many, to learn that the program of the British Labor Party is founded upon the instinct of mother love, but it is true.

How will the Socialist Party meet this instinct—with an appeal to class consciousness?

The Social Unit, the Community Center movement, the Public Ownership League, all these are later-day manifestations of the social processes going on under our very eyes. What hope is there for the Socialist Party if it persists in adhering to its Utopian, antisocial principles?

The lesson of Social Evolution is this: Socialism must be the culmination of a consumer movement: it will be attained in response to the social interests of the majority as a more efficient means of solving their common problem of security in the means of life.

A movement or a political party which seeks to be both Socialist and scientific must study the laws of Social Evolution and base its activities upon the modern manifestations of these laws. The movement or the political party that will do this will find that it must be a consumer movement, not a producer movement; a social movement, not a class movement; a democratic movement, not a movement for a dictatorship.

The practical program of the International Socialist movement, the program of the hated *moderate* Socialists and *social patriots*, fulfills all but one of the necessary requirements. It is the program of a consumer movement, a social movement, a democratic movement. But it is not the program of a scientific movement. They who sponsor this practical program believe that their Marxian theoretical principles constitute the scientific element in their movement. But they don't dare base their practical program upon these *scientific* principles. Experience has taught them that the vast majority of the masses refuse to be attracted by these principles. They therefore had to be rejected as a basis for a practical program.

What constructive purpose have Marxian theo-

retical principles served the International Socialist movement? None whatsoever. They constitute the one *destructive* element not only to the International Socialist movement, but to society as a whole.

To-day we are for the first time privileged to observe the operations of Marxian theory put into practice. Lenine, Trotsky and Bela Kun are attempting to apply Marxian principles in a practical way. They are forcing the proletariat, at the point of the bayonet, to accept Marxian principles. They do not dare grant the proletariat the opportunity to express his preference at the ballot box. The reason is obvious. It is necessary, therefore, to shoot Marxian principles into the proletariat. What must be the inevitable outcome of this tragic burlesque? This trio of comic opera revolutionists will either be overthrown or, to escape this fate, they will be compelled to make concessions upon concessions, compromise upon compromise, until the practical program based upon Marxian principles will be completely discarded and replaced by a practical program identical with that of the *moderate* Socialists and *social patriots*. It is the proletariat who must pay the fearful price in anguish and blood for the practical education of these self-appointed emancipators.

And where are they attempting to put Marxian theory into practice—in countries where capitalism has attained its maximum development and has paved the way for Socialism? Not at all. Only countries like Russia and Hungary, where there is

no developed capitalism, fall prey to these scientific Marxists.

The highly developed capitalism of the United States, England and Germany offers an impregnable defense to the schemings of these dictators to the proletariat. Only when the resistance of the social body is broken down do these *Marxists* obtain their opportunity to pounce down upon their unsuspecting and defenseless victim and enforce their will upon him. That, of course, is *the* scientific way of establishing the Socialist system of society!

If, in the face of all these outstanding facts, the Socialist Party of this country, in common with the International Socialist movement, should insist on holding fast to Marxian principles in theory, though repudiating them in practice, its doom is inevitable. It will be wrecked and torn asunder by its own inherent contradictions. It will disintegrate and die. Marxian theory, like a dead weight, will bear it down and bring about its complete destruction.

But should the Socialist Party in common with the International Socialist movement, in an effort to prove itself worthy of Marx, undertake a scientific investigation of its problems, it would have taken the first constructive step towards its regeneration. Such an investigation cannot limit itself, as heretofore, to a discussion of policy and tactics. Have we not had enough of such discussions?

For fifty long years we have done nothing but discuss policy and tactics, and what has it availed us? We must now get down to fundamentals. We must

prove that we are *genuine* Marxists. We must have the courage to ask the question, *What is scientific Socialism?* And we must search for the answer by means of the scientific method and thus prove our true loyalty to Marx.

Marx consecrated his life to but a single purpose, to prove that Socialism, to be scientific, cannot be the product of some ingenious brain, but must be based upon the laws of Social Evolution.

To this test would Marx have submitted his principles and conclusions, were he living to-day. They who would honor Marx must defend his life labors against those who would divert them to destructive and antisocial purposes. Marx believed his labors completed. Social Evolution proved him mistaken. As true students and disciples our obvious duty does not end with the worship of his conclusions, but consists of the far nobler task of carrying his unfinished work to a more advanced stage, thus contributing something toward the sum total of human knowledge and achievements.

What he left for us, his disciples, to determine, is whether his principles were based upon the laws of Social Evolution. Every trait in his makeup indicated that this was his mandate to his disciples. That mandate we must now carry out.

Marx's first duty was to science. Our first duty, likewise, must be to science. If science dictates that we must discard Marxian principles, we have no choice in the matter. If Marxian principles are not based upon the laws of Social Evolution, they are

Utopian. We have found that not only are they Utopian, but antisocial, and therefore a most destructive and menacing force in society. None knew better than Marx the dangerous and destructive character of a Utopian movement. It was for these reasons that he devoted himself to a study of the laws of Social Evolution in the hope of being able to conform the Socialist movement to the laws of social progress, thus making it a scientific and therefore a constructive movement. He failed of his purpose, and it now devolves upon us to carry out and complete his task.

The International Socialist movement can serve Marx only in so far as it serves society. It can serve society only in proportion as it emancipates itself from the antisocial Utopian dogma which has played such havoc with the movement and proved such a destructive force in society. Instead of discarding the practical program as the so-called *Marxians* would have us do, Social Evolution clearly indicates that it is the Marxian theoretical principles which must be discarded. The laws of Social Evolution furnish the scientific principles as a basis for the practical program.

As a democratic, social movement, serving the masses as consumers, Socialism will for the first time become a scientific Socialist movement. No more will it combat other social movements on the mistaken theory that the class struggle at the point of production is the law of social progress. On the contrary, henceforth, it will support every social

movement aiming at some measure of social progress.

In England the Socialist movement must unite with the British Labor Party. In our country the Socialist Party must support the Farmer Labor Party upon the basis of its social program. It must unite with the Non-Partisan League. It must pave the way for union with the groups of broadminded and socially visioned men and women who, repelled by the antisocial principles of the Socialist Party, feel compelled to launch a movement for a new party. The Social Unit movement, the Community Center movement, the Public Ownership League, because of their social spirit deserve the encouragement and support of every true Socialist.

It is society that is exploited by the profit-making class. Every social reform enacted by the will of the people as expressed through a democratic State, constitutes a blow at the profit system. Organized society in its efforts to solve its problem of existence will first abolish those groups of the profit-making class that stand in the way of social progress. Through a process of furthering the consumer interests of the American people, society, after abolishing the profit principle in transportation, communication and distribution, will work back to and finally take over production. Thus will the profit system disappear, and the Socialist system of society completely evolve. Not in the interest of a class, but in the interest of the American people, will exploitation be abolished. With Abraham Lincoln we can say,

this country and all that is within it belongs to the people who inhabit it, and we must add, and who render a socially necessary service.

Our appeal must be made to the social conscience, to social patriotism in the interest of society as a whole. We must appeal to the manhood and the womanhood of the country to join us in an effort to complete the great task undertaken by the fathers of our country, to secure for our people *life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*. Only through Socialism can this great aim be attained, and only through social effort is Socialism possible. The word *Socialism* is thrice ennobled by the knowledge that not one drop of human blood need stain the purity of its birth. On the contrary, it is to be the final culmination of the ever-expanding social consciousness of the inherent value and nobility of human brotherhood.

The democratic State, which is the highest expression of political brotherhood, is the indispensable tool by which to attain industrial and social brotherhood. To speak of destroying the State is the height of reaction. The democratic State is the product of social progress. It is the business of scientific Socialists to advance social progress instead of being instruments of destruction. It may be well to recall once more the warning uttered by Marx that "it is not a question of putting through some Utopian system, but of taking a conscious part in the process of social transformation which is going on before our very eyes." To-day, as throughout all history, the process of social transformation going on before our

very eyes does not manifest itself as a class movement of producers, but as a social movement of consumers continuing the historic purpose of eliminating uncertainty in the means of life.

Will my Comrades of the International Socialist movement co-operate with this historic process and thus prove themselves worthy disciples of Marx?

APPENDIX I

AN ANALYSIS OF HILLQUIT'S ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST SITUATION

THE New York *Call* of May 21, 1919, published a three-column article from the pen of Morris Hillquit on the "Socialist Task and Outlook."

Hillquit, in common with the rest of his Comrades, is greatly perturbed over the collapse of the International Socialist movement and the upheaval within Socialist ranks in America. "It is safe to assert," says Hillquit, "that at no time since the formation of the First International has the Socialist movement of the world been in a state of such physical disunion, moral ferment and intellectual confusion as it is to-day." No one, with the slightest knowledge of the facts, will contend that the seriousness of the situation is overstated by Hillquit.

Not having been in active contact with the Socialist situation for over a year, Hillquit was free from the heat and excitement of partisan strife, and therefore in an unusually advantageous position to undertake a serious and far-reaching analysis of the problems confronting the International Socialist movement. His contribution to the *Call* is offered as a matured study of our problems, with their cause unerringly disclosed and the cure readily sug-

gested. Let us, then, as good students, sit at the feet of the master and observe his method of arriving at his diagnosis as to the true nature of the disease that is gnawing at the vitals of the International Socialist movement, and the remedies that must be applied to insure a permanent cure.

Since the very beginning of the World War, Hillquit has been obsessed by paradoxes. Some we have already noted elsewhere. In his latest contribution he points out a new crop of paradoxes, all his own recent discoveries:

The World War, [he says,] has placed the Socialist movement in Europe before a situation which it had not foreseen . . . and it reacted to it in a most *unexpected and disheartening manner*. Far from proving the formidable bulwark against war which their friends and enemies alike had believed them to be, the powerful cohorts of European Socialists, on the whole, supported their capitalist governments in their capitalist war almost as enthusiastically and unreservedly as the most loyal Junker classes, and when, with the collapse of the war, the Socialist revolutions broke out in several countries, their forms of struggle were equally startling. The bourgeoisie, against whom the revolutions were directed, made little or no effective resistance, and the fight, repressive and sanguinary at times, was principally among those who before the war called each other Comrades in the Socialist movement.

There is something radically wrong in a movement that could mature *such sad paradoxes* and that wrong must be discovered and eliminated, if the International Socialist movement is to survive as an effective instrument of the working class revolution. . . . What were the economic causes which deflected the Socialist movement of Europe from the path of revolutionary, proletarian internationalism? And the answer is as *startling and paradoxical* as the entire recent course of the Socialist

movement. It was the economic organization of the European workers *and the pressure of their immediate economic interests* [as understood by them] that broke the solidarity of the Socialist International. [Italics mine.]

Precisely. We hasten to congratulate Comrade Hillquit on his brilliant, albeit paradoxical, diagnosis. The shattered and warring International furnishes the tragic but eloquent proof how Utopian is the Marxian conception that class conflict sways man's actions and is the determining motive power ruling in society. Preaching, no matter how eloquent, no matter how persistent and enduring, cannot create social laws. The masses may listen and appear convinced, but when put to the test the true social laws come sharply to the surface and demonstrate their inexorable control over social processes. When the war came on, "the revolutionary, proletarian International" sought to separate the proletariat from the rest of society and bind them fast with its man-made antisocial theory of class conflict as the primal force in history. And what was the consequence? The revolutionary International was burst asunder, shattered to atoms, a victim to its own Utopianism. The primal instinct of the masses dictated their course and determined their actions. They turned their backs on the class conflict theory and in harmony with all other classes in their respective nations rushed to the defense of their *social* interests to which the war held out an immediate threat.

Hillquit is absolutely correct in stating further

that the striving of the organized workers to preserve their economic position within the industrial system of their country and to protect it against the menace of enemy capitalists, is the basis of the war patriotism of their parliamentary representatives.

If this clear explanation as furnished by himself, appears "startling and paradoxical" to Hillquit, it is but a proof that he hasn't the slightest conception of the true laws of Social Evolution. Whenever he observes phenomena of the operations of the true laws of Social Evolution, he is bewildered and writes them down as "startling paradoxes," of which he appears to have gathered quite a collection.

Hillquit is very much annoyed and put out by the puzzling pranks played by modern history. "History has recently shown an almost provoking disregard for preconceived theories and rigid formulæ," he complains. Do you wish us to infer from this, Comrade Hillquit, that until recently history *did* conform to "preconceived theories and rigid formulæ"? Can you point to a single epoch in which Marx's theories were not disregarded by history? The fact that Marx laid down some preconceived theories and rigid formulæ for the guidance of history doesn't necessarily imply that history will take the slightest notice of them. And just because a large group of followers, who call themselves *scientific Socialists*, have devoted more than seventy years to the impossible task of forcing history to conform to preconceived theories and rigid formulæ, is it to be expected that history, out of gratitude, will depart

from her true path and purpose? History spurns those who would seek to master and control her actions, her reward going only to those who can understand and will co-operate with her.

Let us return to Hillquit. We have seen that he has discerned the motive which prompted the masses to turn from the path of revolutionary, proletarian, internationalism. It was due to the pressure of their immediate economic interests ("as understood by them"). But what is the meaning of the parenthesis? By whom else could *the pressure of their immediate economic interests* have been better understood than *by them*? Is that pressure better understood by Hillquit? And should the European workers have gone first to Hillquit for a more *revolutionary and scientific* understanding of the pressure of their immediate economic interest? It seems that the workers felt in no need of advice. There was quite a group who with views similar to those of Hillquit's tried their utmost to force their own *scientific understanding* of the workers' economic interests. The workers ignored them.

While Hillquit may believe that they can have but a parenthetical understanding of their immediate economic interests, the workers have shown that they have a most practical and farsighted understanding; an understanding which indicates to them the harmony of their social interests with those of other classes within their nation. The war threatened the social status of the workers, their status as social beings and consumers, precisely as it threat-

ened that of the other classes, and it was this harmony of social interests that acted as the binding force in every nation.

Hillquit undertook a survey of all countries with a view to determining where Socialism had been "betrayed" most completely, and why:

The countries in which the Socialist movement failed most lamentably *are precisely those in which the movement was most closely linked with organized labor*, while the principles of *International Solidarity* were upheld most rigorously in countries in which the economic labor movement was either very weak or *quite detached from the Socialist movement*. [My italics.]

Well do we remember how Socialists—and Hillquit among them—pointed proudly to Germany and Austria as shining examples of consistent trade union policy of using *both arms of the labor movement*, their trade union on the economic and the Socialist party on the political field. But now this pride must turn to shame, for *the countries in which the Socialist movement failed most lamentably are precisely those in which the movement was most closely linked with organized labor*.

What, then, is the inference to be drawn from these facts? [asks Hillquit.] Shall revolutionary Socialism hereafter disassociate itself from organized labor? By no means. A Socialist movement without the support of the workers is a sort of disembodied spirit; in fact, a spook. Socialism must remain the political and spiritual guide of the working class, but it must *reorganize and re-educate the working class*. [My italics.]

Now let us see where we are at.

Revolutionary Socialism was betrayed most thor-

oughly wherever it was linked with labor most thoroughly, and, conversely, wherever the Socialist movement was detached from the labor movement it upheld its "principles of international solidarity." How is this "paradox" to be explained?

The trade union movement is based upon the same underlying principles as the International Socialist movement. It concerns itself with exploitation at the point of production—it is an economic class movement.

The Socialist movement has for years concentrated its energies in an effort to "educate," cajole or brow-beat organized labor into taking its economic class interests into the political field. But organized labor refused to budge, as it seemed to recognize that the political field is essentially a *social* field and not a class field, and that the political method is essentially a *social* method, not a class method.

In the United States the labor movement preceded the Socialist movement. No sooner did the Socialist movement make its appearance than it proceeded to make plans to "capture" the labor movement. It sought to force the labor movement to take its economic class problems into the political field. The Socialists' attempt was defeated. In Germany and Austria the Socialist movement preceded the labor movement. The labor movement of those countries is, in fact, the creation, the child of the Socialist movement. But did the Socialist movement, though it fathered these labor movements, succeed here, whereas it had failed in other countries?

Did the labor movements of Germany and Austria take their economic class interests into the political field through the Socialist movement? Not at all. Despite the wishes of the *revolutionary leaders*, the labor movement forced the Socialist movement to concern itself with the *social*, with the consumer interests of the workers, while through its economic organizations it cared for their class interests as producers.

The Socialist movement, to retain the political support of the workers, was compelled to adopt a social program, and not a class program.

Then came the war. Again the *revolutionary leaders* sought to separate the workers along lines of "class solidarity" from the other classes with whom they had common social interests. Were they successful this time in their attempt to apply their "historic law"? Unfortunately, while the class conflict theory may be a historic law, the workers don't seem to know it and refuse to be governed by it. The war offered an immediate threat to the social interests of the workers; they, therefore, rallied to the support of their governments and attached themselves more firmly to the other classes in an effort to protect their common social interests.

The Socialist movement in those countries found itself face to face with a very definite and concrete problem which presented a choice of but one of two solutions—loyalty to Marxian principles and loss of the support of the workers, or loyalty to the workers and abandoning of Marxian principles. It was a

hard choice, but it had to be made. And what influenced their decision? Why, it was none other than Hillquit's own principle that "a Socialist movement without the support of the workers is a sort of disembodied spirit; in fact, a spook." The Socialist movement feared to be deprived of the support of the workers and left alone, for it was afraid of spooks. And yet Hillquit points an accusing finger and says that the Parliaments of Germany and France were the scenes of Socialist betrayal!

The workers rushed to protect their social interests and the Socialist movement, to retain its hold upon the masses, was compelled to follow suit.

Was this the first instance in which the Socialists permitted themselves to be led by the workers when a vital question came up for decision? For the answer, we refer Comrade Hillquit to a well-known work entitled, *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, in which he will find a passage dealing with a similar situation and which reads as follows:

While the leaders were discussing the theoretical aspects of the problem, the masses, as usual in practical questions, solved it, and, as usual, solved it right. The Socialists went into politics yielding to the instincts of the masses rather than following the reasoned policies of the leaders.

The same holds true of the war, for the Socialists supported the war, *yielding to the instincts of the masses rather than to the policies of the leaders.*

The organized labor movement was consistent throughout. With the oncome of the war in the United States, the labor movement, though organ-

ized as a class movement of producers, reacted at once to the more vital social interests of its members and made common cause with all other classes in furtherance of their common social interests. There was no hesitancy on the part of American organized labor which, uninfluenced by class solidarity dogma, wasted little time in the process of breaking away from its spell.

Comrade Hillquit gives a long list of countries—Germany, Austria, Belgium, France and Great Britain, which were scenes of Socialist “betrayal.” And in what countries was there no “betrayal”?

Hillquit is forced to go to Russia, Italy and the Balkan countries, in which organized labor was a *negligible factor* in the Socialist movement, the Socialists have successfully withstood the wave of nationalist reaction. Not a very formidable list and little to boast of, even if it were a hundred per cent true. But is it? What proof does Comrade Hillquit offer that Russian labor and Socialists did not support the war? The fact that Lenine and Trotsky did not support the war is apparently all sufficient for Hillquit. Assuming that Hillquit's statement is entirely correct, what is the *logical* deduction to be made from his own facts? An irresponsible person, having nothing to lose, can afford to be reckless. The same holds true of a movement.

The Socialist Party of the United States adopted the St. Louis platform, because it had nothing to lose by sticking to dogma. It never had a grip upon organized labor and therefore could not very well

stand to lose what it never had. But it did have a substantial membership and general following, and what happened to that after the St. Louis platform was adopted? And what is taking place within the remaining membership to this very day? What a simple task it is to make fiery, r-r-revolutionary "class-conscious" speeches calling for "mass action," when you have nothing to lose and when no one pays the slightest attention to you.

But the Socialist Parties of the European countries were faced with an entirely different situation. They did have a grip upon the labor movement and stood to lose that grip unless they did labor's bidding. Labor won. Hillquit is quite right when he says, "Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring in Germany, Fritz Adler in Austria, Lenin and Trotsky in Russia, and Jean Louquet in France, *all intellectuals*, that led the Socialist revolts in their countries, because intellectuals are long on theory and short on facts; but the movement as a whole was compelled to join the workers in support of their social interests "as understood by them," and who, Comrade Hillquit, can claim to be better qualified to understand their interests than the workers themselves?

And now let us turn to Hillquit's remedy for the ills of the Second International and note his suggestions as to how "its mistakes are to be avoided in the future."

Hillquit is assuredly right in saying that this is the main question which agitates and divides the

Socialist movement to-day and *upon the solution of which the future of our movement depends.*

With a full appreciation of the gravity of the situation and the disastrous results that must follow a false step, Hillquit delivers himself as follows:

The first task of the post-war Socialist International must be to organize and reorganize all grades and strata of labor on broad *class lines*, not only nationally, but internationally. Not as trade unions, nor even as mere industrial unions, but as one working class union. *This is the first lesson to be drawn from the recent experiences and failures of the old International.* [Italics mine.]

And there you are! Here is the remedy, now go and apply it. Organize labor on "broad class lines"—Hillquit would have it so. Has history "recently" shown an almost "provoking disregard for preconceived theories and rigid formulæ"? Well, "the first lesson to be drawn from the recent experience" is, that history must be taught a lesson she will not soon forget! The post-war Socialist International must organize and reorganize labor into one international working class union and thus teach history that she shouldn't be so provoking and should show proper regard for preconceived theories and rigid formulæ! Such is Hillquit's remedy for avoiding the mistakes of the Second International! *It is the solution upon which the future of our movement depends.* How would Marx have greeted such a "scientific solution"? Does it conform with his ideas of scientific procedure, which is that of "taking a conscious part in the process of *social* transformation which is

going on before our very eyes," or is it more in keeping with his views of "empty-headed and conscienceless play with propaganda"?

Hillquit tells us that Socialism must remain the political and spiritual guide of the working class, but it must reorganize and re-educate the working class. But why *reorganize* and *re-educate*? Because it has not properly exercised its political and spiritual guidance in the past? If this is his view, Hillquit is laboring under the same fatal error as did the Second International. How can Socialism remain what it isn't and never was? The Second International believed that it was the political and spiritual guide to the working class, but the facts clearly indicate that exactly the reverse is true. It was the working class that was the political and spiritual guide to the Second International.

How did such a "paradoxical" situation come to pass? It was all due to over-ambition, Comrade Hillquit. Ambition, you know, has slain many a man and many a movement. The Second International was not content with being "Left." It was not satisfied to be Left as an incoherent sect. It was ambitious; it wanted to grow in numbers and in influence; it wanted to capture the masses; it went Right to the masses, with the result that it was captured *by* the masses and compelled to stay Right with them. Thereafter, it was the masses who dictated the policy of the Second International. The principles of a class movement of producers were Left behind, the masses insisting that they give way

to a positive program based upon a social movement of consumers. The masses had *re-educated* and *re-organized* the Second International and became "its political and spiritual guide." It is here, Comrade Hillquit, where you must look for the answer to your question, "Why did the Second International fail?"

"It was not parliamentarism which was primarily responsible for the mischief," says Hillquit; "on the whole, the Socialists in Parliament expressed the sentiments of *their constituents* pretty faithfully." Precisely. They had to or they would have been "Left"—without constituents. Show me a movement that is consistently Left and I will show you a movement that is consistently Left—severely alone by the masses. Any movement can have the support of the masses provided it is willing to pay the price, and the price exacted by the masses is, that all "preconceived theories and rigid formulæ" be abandoned, and that thereafter the masses control the policy and use the Party in their own interest as "understood by them." The Second International paid the price, and who dare say that the masses have not faithfully carried out their end of the bargain? See to what huge proportions the Second International had grown while the contract was in force. Wherever the Socialists broke the contract and reverted back to their preconceived theories of class strife, the masses turned from them in disgust.

The Second International failed, but for different

reasons than those advanced by Hillquit. It failed because it was not an emancipating movement, but a slave movement, and the most pathetic kind of a slave movement, for it was entirely unconscious of its slavish condition. At first it was a slave to Marxian "preconceived theories and rigid formulæ." Then it became a slave to ambition. It wanted to grow, to attract the masses. But the masses refused to be attracted by theories. Too much of a slave to Marxism to drop his theories, too much of a slave to ambition to drop the masses, it solved the problem by binding itself over to a third master, the working class. Thus did it "capture the working class." And on top of all this the Second International is a slave to the hallucination that it is a scientific movement of emancipation, acting as the "political and spiritual guide to the labor movement"! And this is the movement that assured the capitalist system that it was in imminent danger of collapse—a victim to its own inherent contradictions! The capitalist system is still here and organized into an International, but where is the Socialist International?

Hillquit turns next to the existing situation in Russia, Hungary and Germany. "In all cases," says Hillquit, "in which the proletariat of a country in revolution has assumed the reins of government as a pure working class government, determined upon the immediate socialization of the country, the true Socialists of all countries will support it." What does Hillquit mean by a "pure working class government"? If there is to be an immediate socialization

of the country, then why not a pure Socialist government? Or has Hillquit come to believe with Lenine and Trotsky that *the proletarian state, like every other state, is an apparatus of repression*, and therefore a pure Socialist government would not do as it might be too democratic?

Lenine and Trotsky tell us that the problem of the proletariat consists in *immediately seizing the power of the State*; this seizure of the power of the State means the *destruction of the State apparatus* of the bourgeoisie and the organization of a new proletarian apparatus of power. But Hillquit¹ has been teaching that *the Socialist conception of the world process is evolutionary, not cataclysmic; Socialism has come to build, not to destroy*. Which of these is the *true* Socialist of all countries to support?

Hillquit answers by saying that "the Socialists of the foreign countries are faced by an accomplished fact and by the simple alternative of supporting the revolution or counter revolution." Very well. But what should be the attitude of true Socialists of all countries towards revolutions aiming at a dictatorship of the proletariat and the destruction of the State, where it is not yet an accomplished fact? "True" Socialists must support this aim also, says Hillquit. "In countries like Germany, in which the struggle for mastery lies between two divisions of the Socialist movement, one class conscious and the other opportunist, one radical and the other temporizing, the support of the Socialist International

¹ *Socialism Summed Up*, Hillquit.

must for the same reason go to the former." For what reason? Because they are class conscious and seek to establish a proletarian dictatorship through all the agonies of a civil war? Did Hillquit consider himself a true Socialist when he wrote that *The great modern problems can be solved peacefully and rationally only by a people free to shape its own destinies?*¹ Did the Spartacide group with its dictatorship of the proletariat and the destruction of the State principles offer to the German people a more peaceful and more democratic method of shaping its own destinies than does the present democratic Government?

And now, what about our own country; should true Socialists support the American prototype of the Bolsheviks of Russia and the Spartacists of Germany; that is, the "Left Wing" movement? Why not? The Bolsheviks support them and bid them welcome to the Communist Congress while expressly *excluding* the Socialist Party. But Hillquit says he is opposed to the "Left Wing" movement in the United States because it is essentially reactionary and non-Socialistic. Hillquit seems to believe that only true Socialists of *foreign* countries should support Left Wing movements. He, as a "true" Socialist, supports the Left Wing movement of Russia, Germany and Hungary, while the true Socialists of those countries support the Left Wing movement in the United States. But Hillquit does not agree with the "true" Socialists of foreign countries that the Left Wing stands for "true" Socialism in the United States.

¹ *Socialism Summed Up*, Hillquit.

No, no; the Left Wing of this country "is essentially reactionary and non-Socialistic," but transplant the Left Wing movement to some European country—Ah! then Hillquit as a "true" Socialist will support it "for the same reason."

But wait; Hillquit has a scientific and logical (?) explanation for his paradoxical position. He says, "To prate about the dictatorship of the proletariat and the 'workers' Soviets' in the United States at this time is to deflect the Socialist propaganda from its realistic basis," and is therefore "essentially reactionary and non-Socialistic," but "to prate about the dictatorship of the proletariat and the workers' Soviets in Russia, Hungary and Germany at this time" is, of course, essentially progressive and Socialistic! But how are we to know the exact time when it becomes Socialistic to "prate about the dictatorship of the proletariat"? Upon this knowledge depends whether we are to come under Hillquit's classification as being either reactionary and non-Socialistic, or progressive and Socialistic.

It is vitally important, therefore, that for the answer we turn to none but authoritative sources. And where can we find a better authority than Hillquit himself? Here is his answer:

They [Socialists] hold that no system can be radically changed until it is ripe for the transformation, and *they consider the degree of development of every country of prime importance in determining whether it offers fertile ground for the success of Socialism.* [My italics.]¹

¹ *Socialism Summed Up*, p. 33.

Can you not see that the degree of development of Russia and Hungary makes it of "prime importance" that Hillquit as a "scientific" Socialist give his support to those who "prate of the dictatorship of the proletariat" for those countries at this time? But the backwardness (?) of industrial development in the United States as compared with Russia and Hungary is scientific proof that "to prate about the dictatorship of the proletariat" in this country "at this time is essentially reactionary and non-Socialistic."

It is with such scientific arguments that our "constructive" leaders hope to conquer the Left Wing movement. No wonder Left Wing members take such keen delight in exposing the logic of their opponents.

Hillquit seems to be well aware of the hopeless sterility of his argument as a means of bringing about a reconciliation between the several factions, for he himself says that it would be futile to preach reconciliation and union where antagonism runs high. "Let the Comrades separate honestly, freely and without rancor. . . . Better a hundred times to have two numerically small Socialist organizations . . . than to have one big party torn by dissents and squabbles, an impotent colossus on feet of clay."

This is by no means a new remedy. It was utilized twenty years ago, as a means of curing the dissensions within the Socialist Labor Party. After twenty years of slow and laborious effort to build up a new national organization to which the masses might turn with confidence, we find that we have built a

Frankenstein instead, "an impotent colossus on feet of clay," and therefore must break it up and start all over again.

Such is the only remedy that suggests itself to the leader of a movement which claims that scientific understanding of social processes is the unerring guide for its actions!

Hillquit apparently favors two small Socialist organizations. But there are more than two Socialist organizations already, Comrade Hillquit. There is the Socialist Labor Party. Then there is the group that split away from the party following the adoption of the St. Louis platform. And between the Left and Right Wings stands the group of the Center, unable to attach itself permanently to either side. So we have five numerically small organizations, each contending that it holds the only true scientific Socialist position.

In the face of these sombre facts, how hollow sounds Hillquit's closing and forced flourish: "Time for action is near. Let us clear the decks."

Yes, the time for action is near and here, but the ship is upon the rocks, without compass and without light; a prey to the waves of dogma and passion.

With the Left Wing problem thus amicably "solved," Hillquit offers a "constructive" program for those still remaining within the party. Here it is:

The platform and the policies of the Socialist Party *must be revised in keeping not only with the development of Socialism abroad, but also with regard to the changes wrought by the war in the*

United States. . . . Propaganda in International Socialism in the *modern and advanced meaning of the term*, propaganda of new *class-line unionism*, etc. [My italics.]

Why does Hillquit speak of the "modern" and "advanced" meaning of the term? Should he not have said the old but relegated meaning of the term? All the modern critics of the Second International agree that its failure was due to the fact that it "forgot the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism." Hillquit agrees with Lenine and Trotsky, the Spartacists and the Left Wingers, that the way to avoid the mistakes of the Second International in the future is to hark back to the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism; to make the "modern" and "advanced" synonymous with the ancient and retrogressive; thus alone is it possible to create a "modern" and "advanced" scientific Socialist International!

The fundamental revisions suggested by Hillquit are identically the same as those of the Left Wing group. He frankly states, that he would be the last man in the party to ignore or misunderstand the *sound revolutionary impulse* which animates the rank and file of this *new* movement, but—but Hillquit lacks the courage and consistency to support it, *in this country*.

Hillquit published his analysis of the national and international Socialist situation because he was convinced that the voluminous discussions that had thus far been published "furnishes no guide for correction," therefore Hillquit's contribution. If there was

a doubt still lurking in anyone's mind as to the hopeless sterility of modern Socialist thought (?) Hillquit's contribution should have eliminated it.

What would have been Marx's opinion of such a "guide for correction"? Did Marx, too, look to man-made dogma formulated in years past for his "guide for correction"? Or did he look for them in the actual social processes? Did Marx believe that the scientific Socialist is he who seeks to force some "preconceived theories and rigid formulæ" upon society, or did he consecrate his life to the task of proving that scientific Socialism must be based on an understanding of and co-operation with Social Evolution?

To be considered a genuine disciple of Marx, Hillquit must for once emulate the methods of Marx. Marx is no longer here to do the thinking for him. He must undertake an independent investigation of the workings of Social Evolution and determine for himself why it is that social processes fail to conform with Marxian conclusions. Then he will find that "the answer is as startling and paradoxical as the entire recent course of the Socialist movement."

APPENDIX II

“MANIFESTO AND PROGRAM OF THE LEFT WING SECTION SOCIALIST PARTY”

“Proletarian revolutions, such as those of the nineteenth century, criticize themselves constantly; constantly interrupt themselves in their own course; come back to what seems to have been accomplished, in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half measures, weaknesses and meannesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth, and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature; constantly recoil in fear before the undefined monster magnitude of their own objects—until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out: ‘*Hic Rhodus, hic salta!*’”—KARL MARX, *Eighteenth Brumaire*.

“Between the capitalistic society and the communistic lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat. Now the 1875 program has neither anything to do with the latter, nor with the future state of the communistic society. Its political demands contain nothing outside of the old democratic litany, known to all the world—universal franchise, direct legislation, popular rights, protection of the people, etc. It is simply an echo of the old People’s Party, the Peace and Liberty Alliance.”—KARL MARX. *Critique Soc. Dem. Program*, 1875.

THE members of the Socialist Party are entitled to an explanation for the issuance of this pamphlet by the Left Wing Section.

We are a very active and growing section of the Socialist Party who are attempting to reach the rank and file with our urgent message over the heads of the powers that be, who, through inertia or a lack of vision, cannot see the necessity for a critical analysis of the party's policies and tactics.

The official Socialist Party press is in the main closed to us; therefore, we cannot adequately present our side of the case.

In the various discussions that arise wherever party members or delegates assemble, both sides grow too heated for calm, dispassionate judgment.

Therefore, we have decided to issue our *Manifesto* and *Program* in pamphlet form, so that the rank and file may read and judge our case on its merits.

Comrades—and this is addressed to members of the party—the situation is such that a careful study of our position is absolutely imperative.

“MANIFESTO”

Prior to August, 1914, the nations of the world lived on a volcano. Violent eruptions from time to time gave warning of the cataclysm to come, but the diplomats and statesmen managed to localize the outbreaks, and the masses, slightly aroused, sank

back into their accustomed lethargy with doubts and misgivings, and the subterranean fires continued to smolder.

Many trusted blindly—some in their statesmen, some in the cohesive power of Christianity, their common religion, and some in the growing strength of the international Socialist movement. Had not the German Social-Democracy exchanged dramatic telegrams with the French Socialist Party, each pledging itself not to fight in case their governments declare war on each other! A general strike of workers led by these determined Socialists would quickly bring the governments to their senses!

So the workers reasoned, until the thunder-clap of Sarajevo and Austria's ultimatum to Serbia. Then, suddenly, the storm broke. Mobilization everywhere. Everywhere declarations of war. In three or four days Europe was in arms.

The present structure of Society—Capitalism—with its pretensions to democracy on the one hand, and its commercial rivalries, armament rings and standing armies on the other, all based on the exploitation of the working class and the division of the loot, was cast into the furnace of war. Two things only could issue forth: either international capitalist control, through a League of Nations, or Social Revolution and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Both of these forces are to-day contending for world power.

The Social Democracies of Europe, unable or unwilling to meet the crisis, were themselves hurled

into the conflagration, to be tempered or consumed by it.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Great demonstrations were held in every European country by Socialists protesting against their governments' declarations of war, and mobilizations for war. And we know that these demonstrations were rendered impotent by the complete surrender of the Socialist parliamentary leaders and the official Socialist press, with their "justifications" of "defensive wars" and the safeguarding of "democracy."

Why the sudden change of front? Why did the Socialist leaders in the parliaments of the belligerents vote the war credits? Why did not Moderate Socialism carry out the policy of the Basle *Manifesto*, namely: the converting of an imperialistic war into a civil war—into a proletarian revolution? Why did it either openly favor the war or adopt a policy of petty-bourgeois pacifism?

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERATE "SOCIALISM"

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Social-Democracies of Europe set out to "legislate Capitalism out of office." The class struggle was to be won in the capitalist legislatures. Step by step concessions were to be wrested from the state; the working class and the Socialist parties were to be strengthened by means of "constructive" reform

and social legislation; each concession would act as a rung in the ladder of Social Revolution, upon which the workers could climb step by step, until finally, some bright sunny morning, the peoples would awaken to find the Co-operative Commonwealth functioning without disorder, confusion or hitch on the ruins of the capitalist state.

And what happened? When a few legislative seats had been secured, the thunderous denunciations of the Socialist legislators suddenly ceased. No more were the parliaments used as platforms from which the challenge of revolutionary Socialism was flung to all the corners of Europe. Another era had set in, the era of "constructive" social reform legislation. Dominant Modern Socialism accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of its action and strengthened that state. All power to shape the policies and tactics of the Socialist parties was intrusted to the parliamentary leaders. And these lost sight of Socialism's original purpose; their goal became "constructive reforms" and cabinet portfolios—the "co-operation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly declaring that the coming of Socialism was a concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. "Moderate Socialism" in the hands of these parliamentary leaders was now ready to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state, even to the extent of defending the bourgeoisie against the working class

—as in the first Briand Ministry in France, when the official party press was opened to a defense of the shooting of striking railway-workers at the order of the Socialist Bourgeois Coalition Cabinet.

“SAUSAGE SOCIALISM”

This situation was brought about by mixing the democratic cant of the eighteenth century with scientific Socialism. The result was what Rosa Luxemburg called “sausage Socialism.” The “Moderates” emphasized petty-bourgeois social reformism in order to attract tradesmen, shopkeepers and members of the professions, and, of course, the latter flocked to the Socialist movement in great numbers, seeking relief from the constant grinding between corporate capital and awakening labor.

The Socialist organizations actively competed for votes, on the basis of social reforms, with the bourgeois-liberal political parties. And so they catered to the ignorance and prejudices of the workers, trading promises of immediate reforms for votes.

Dominant “moderate Socialism” forgot the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism, forgot its function as a proletarian movement—“the most resolute and advanced section of the working-class parties”—and permitted the bourgeois and self-seeking trade union elements to shape its policies and tactics. This was the condition in which the Social-Democracies of Europe found themselves at the outbreak of war in 1914. Demoralized and con-

fused by the cross-currents within their own parties, vacillating and compromising with the bourgeois state, they fell a prey to social-patriotism and nationalism.

SPARTACIDES AND BOLSHEVIKI

But revolutionary Socialism was not destined to lie inert for long. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg and Otto Ruhle organized the Spartacus Group. But their voices were drowned in the roar of cannon and the shrieks of the dying and the maimed.

Russia, however, was to be the first battleground where "moderate" and revolutionary Socialism should come to grips for the mastery of the state. The breakdown of the corrupt, bureaucratic Czarist regime opened the flood-gates of Revolution.

Three main contending parties attempted to ride into power on the revolutionary tide; the Cadets, the "moderate Socialists" (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists), and the revolutionary Socialists—the Bolsheviks. The Cadets were first to be swept into power; but they tried to stem the still-rising flood with a few abstract political ideals, and were soon carried away. The soldiers, workers, and peasants could no longer be fooled by phrases. The Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries succeeded the Cadets. And now came the crucial test: would they, in accord with Marxian teachings, make themselves the ruling class and sweep away the old con-

ditions of production, and thus prepare the way for the Co-operative Commonwealth? Or would they tinker with the old machinery and try to foist it on the masses as something just as good?

They did the latter and proved for all time that "moderate Socialism" cannot be trusted.

"Moderate Socialism" was not prepared to seize the power for the workers during a revolution. "Moderate Socialism" had a rigid formula—"constructive social reform legislation within the capitalist state" and to that formula it clung. It believed that bourgeois democracy could be used as a means of constructing the Socialist system; therefore, it must wait until the people, through a Constituent Assembly, should vote Socialism into existence. And in the meantime, it held that there must be established a Government of Coalition with the enemy, the bourgeoisie. As if, with all the means of controlling public opinion in the hands of the bourgeoisie, a Constituent Assembly could or would ever vote the Socialists into power!

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in society—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; that between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class, through the seizure of the instruments of production and distribution, the abolition of the capitalist state, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a Socialist system. Revolutionary Socialists do not believe that they can be voted into

power. They struggle for the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Then comes the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, of which Marx speaks in his *Critique of the Gotha Program*, when he says: "Between the capitalistic society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Marx and Engels clearly explain the function of the Socialist movement. It is the "moderate Socialists" through intellectual gymnastics, evasions, misquotations and the tearing of sentences and phrases from their context, who make Marx and Engels sponsors for their perverted version of Socialism.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

At the present moment, the Socialist Party of America is agitated by several cross-currents, some local in their character, and some a reflex of cleavages within the European Socialist movements. Many see in this internal dissension merely an unimportant difference of opinion, or at most, dissatisfaction with the control of the party, and the desire to replace those who have misused it with better men.

We, however, maintain that there is a fundamental distinction in views concerning party policies and tactics. And we believe that this difference is so

vast that from our standpoint a radical change in party policies and tactics is necessary.

This essential task is being shirked by our party leaders and officials generally.

Already there is formidable industrial unrest, a seething ferment of discontent, evidences by inarticulate rumblings which presage striking occurrences. The transformation of industry from a war to a peace basis has thoroughly disorganized the economic structure. Thousands upon thousands of workers are being thrown out of work. Demobilized sailors and soldiers find themselves a drug upon the labor market, unless they act as scabs and strike-breakers. Skilled mechanics, fighting desperately to maintain their war-wage and their industrial status, are forced to strike. Women, who during the war had been welcomed into industries hitherto closed to them, are struggling to keep their jobs. And to cap the climax, the capitalists, through their Chambers of Commerce and their Merchants and Manufacturers' Associations, have resolved to take advantage of the situation to break down even the inadequate organizations labor has built up through generations of painful struggle.

The temper of the workers and soldiers, after the sacrifices they have made in the war, is such that they will not endure the reactionary labor conditions so openly advocated by the master class. A series of labor struggles is bound to follow—indeed, is beginning now. Shall the Socialist Party continue to feed the workers with social reform legislation at

this critical period? Shall it approach the whole question from the standpoint of votes and the election of representatives to the legislatures? Shall it emphasize the consumers' point of view, when Socialist principles teach that the worker is robbed at the point of production? Shall it talk about the Cost of Living and Taxation when it should be explaining how the worker is robbed at his job?

There are many signs of the awakening of labor. Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action; the trade unions are organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have won and wrest new concessions from the master class. The organization of the Labor Party is an immature expression of a new spirit in the Labor movement; but a Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would be in general what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party —reforming Capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as "moderate" Socialism; neither is an instrument for the conquest of power.

CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM

Imperialism is the final stage of Capitalism, in which the accumulated capital or surplus of a nation is too great to be reinvested in the home market. The increased productivity of the working class, due to improved machinery and efficiency methods, and the mere subsistence wage which permits the worker to buy back only a small portion of what he pro-

duces, causes an ever-increasing accumulation of commodities, which in turn become capital and must be invested in further production. When Capitalism has reached the stage in which it imports raw materials from undeveloped countries and exports them again in the shape of manufactured products, it has reached its highest development.

This process is universal. Foreign markets, spheres of influence and protectorates, under the intensive development of capitalist industry and finance in turn become highly developed. They, too, seek for markets. National capitalist control, to save itself from ruin, breaks its national bonds and emerges full-grown as a capitalist League of Nations, with international armies and navies to maintain its supremacy.

The United States no longer holds itself aloof, isolated and provincial. It is reaching out for new markets, new zones of influence, new protectorates.

The capitalist class of America is using organized labor for its imperialistic purposes. We may soon expect the capitalist class, in true Bismarckian fashion, to grant factory laws, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, sick benefits, and the whole litter of bourgeois reforms, so that the workers may be kept fit to produce the greatest profits at the greatest speed.

DANGERS TO AMERICAN SOCIALISM

There is danger that the Socialist Party of America might make use of these purely bourgeois reforms to

attract the workers' votes, by claiming that they are victories for Socialism, and that they have been won by Socialist political action; when, as a matter of fact, the object of these master class measures is to prevent the growing class-consciousness of the workers, and to divert them from their revolutionary aim. By agitating for these reforms, therefore, the Socialist Party would be playing into the hands of the American imperialists.

On the basis of the class struggle, then, the Socialist Party of America must reorganize itself, must prepare to come to grips with the master class during the difficult period of capitalist readjustment now going on. This it can do only by teaching the working class the truth about present-day conditions; it must preach revolutionary industrial unionism, and urge all the workers to organize into industrial unions, the only form of labor organization which can cope with the power of great modern aggregations of capital. It must carry on its political campaigns, not merely as a means of electing officials to political office, as in the past, but as a year-round educational campaign to arouse the workers to class-conscious economic and political action, and to keep alive the burning ideal of revolution in the hearts of the people.

POLITICAL ACTION

We assert with Marx that "the class struggle is essentially a political struggle," and we can only

accept his own oft-repeated interpretation of that phrase. The class struggle, whether it manifest itself on the industrial field or in the direct struggle for governmental control, is essentially a struggle for the capture and destruction of the capitalist state. This is a political act. In this broader view of the term "political," Marx includes revolutionary industrial action. In other words, the objective of Socialist industrial action is "political," in the sense that it aims to undermine the bourgeois state, which "is nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another and that no less so in a democratic republic than under a monarchy."

Political action is also and more generally used to refer to participation in election campaigns for the immediate purpose of winning legislative seats. In this sense, too, we urge the use of political action as a revolutionary weapon.

But both in the nature and the purpose of this form of political action, revolutionary Socialism and "moderate Socialism" are completely at odds.

Political action, revolutionary and emphasizing the implacable character of the class struggle, is a valuable means of propaganda. It must at all times struggle to arouse the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat—its use is both agitational and obstructive. It must on all issues wage war upon Capitalism and the state. Revolutionary Socialism uses the forum of parliament for agitation; but it does not intend to and cannot use the bourgeois state as a means of introducing Socialism: this

bourgeois state must be destroyed by the mass action of the revolutionary proletariat. The proletarian dictatorship in the form of a Soviet state is the immediate objective of the class struggle.

Marx declared that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes." This machinery must be destroyed. But "moderate Socialism" makes the state the center of its action.

This attitude towards the state divides the Anarchist (anarcho-syndicalist), the "moderate Socialist" and the revolutionary Socialist. Eager to abolish the state (which is the ultimate purpose of revolutionary Socialism), the Anarchist and Anarcho-Syndicalist fail to realize that a state is necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism; the "moderate Socialist" proposes to use the bourgeois state with its fraudulent democracy, its illusory theory of "unity of all the classes," its standing army, police and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses; the revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state—the state of the organized producers—of the Federated Soviets—on the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced.

Industrial Unionism, the organization of the proletariat in accordance with the integration of industry and for the overthrow of Capitalism, is a necessary phase of revolutionary Socialist agitation. Potentially, industrial unionism constructs the basis

and develops the ideology of the industrial state of Socialism; but industrial unionism alone cannot perform the revolutionary act of seizure of the power of the state, since under the conditions of Capitalism it is impossible to organize the whole working class, or an overwhelming majority, into industrial unions.

It is the task of a revolutionary Socialist party to direct the struggles of the proletariat and provide a program for the culminating crisis. Its propaganda must be so directed that when this crisis comes, the workers will be prepared to accept a program of the following character:

(a) The organization of Workmen's Councils; recognition of, and propaganda for, these mass organizations of the working class as instruments in the immediate struggle, as the form of expression of the class struggle, and as the instruments for the seizure of the power of the state and the basis of the new proletarian state of the organized producers and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(b) Workmen's control of industry, to be exercised by the industrial organizations (industrial unions or Soviets) of the workers and the industrial vote, as against government ownership or state control of industry.

(c) Repudiation of all national debts—with provisions to safeguard small investors.

(d) Expropriation of the banks—a preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.

(e) Expropriation of the railways, and the large (trust) organizations of capital—no compensation

to be paid, as "buying-out" the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the workers; provision, however, to be made during the transition period for the protection of small owners of stock.

(f) The socialization of foreign trade.

These are not the "immediate demands" comprised in the social reform planks now in the platform of our party; they are not a compromise with the capitalist state, but imply a revolutionary struggle against that state and against capitalism, the conquest of power by the proletariat through revolutionary mass action. They imply the new Soviet state of the organized producers, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are preliminary revolutionary measures for the expropriation of capital and the introduction of communist Socialism.

PROGRAM

1. We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms both local and national and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.
2. The party must teach, propagate and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of Capitalism, and the establishment of Socialism through a Proletarian Dictatorship.
3. The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.
4. Realizing that a political party cannot reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organizations

of the working class, and that that is the task of the economic organizations themselves, we demand that the party assist this process of reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary industrial unionism as part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

5. We demand that the official party press be party owned and controlled.

6. We demand that officially recognized educational institutions be party owned and controlled.

7. We demand that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above mentioned.

8. We demand that the National Executive Committee call an immediate emergency national convention for the purpose of formulating party policies and tactics to meet the present crisis.

9. We demand that the Socialist Party repudiate the Berne Congress or any other conference engineered by "moderate Socialists" and social patriots.

10. We demand that the Socialist Party shall elect delegates to the International Congress proposed by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik); that our party shall participate only in a new International with which are affiliated the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacus), and all other Left Wing parties and groups.

APPENDIX III

MANIFESTOS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND STATEMENTS BY LENIN, TROTSKY AND OTHERS

NOTE.—These documents are collected here not only for their historic value, but also because they afford an insight into the minds of men who have been acclaimed intellectual giants to whom has been revealed the key controlling historic processes.

That these men are but fanatical slaves of a false conception of history is patent from the naive and wholly unfulfilled predictions which they put forth with such pretense to masterful understanding.

—A U T H O R .

A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKINGMEN FROM THE SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLIC OF RUSSIA

By N. Lenin

Moscow, August 20, 1918.

Comrades: A Russian Bolshevik who participated in the Revolution of 1905 and for many years afterwards lived in your country has offered to transmit this letter to you. I have grasped this opportunity joyfully, for the revolutionary proletariat of America —in so far as it is the enemy of American imperialism —is destined to perform an important task at this time.

The history of modern civilized America opens with one of those really revolutionary wars of liberation of which there have been so few compared with the enormous number of wars of conquest that were caused, like the present imperialistic war, by squabbles among kings, landholders and capitalists over the division of ill-gotten lands and profits. It was a war of the American people against the English who despoiled America of its resources and held in colonial subjection, just as their "civilized" descendants are draining the lifeblood of hundreds of millions of human beings in India, Egypt and all corners and ends of the world to keep them in subjection.

Since that war 150 years have passed. Bourgeois civilization has born its most luxuriant fruit. By developing the productive forces of organized human labor, by utilizing machines and all the wonders of technique, America has taken the first place among free and civilized nations. But at the same time America, like a few other nations, has become characteristic for the depth of the abyss that divides a handful of brutal millionaires who are stagnating in a mire of luxury, and millions of laboring starving men and women who are always staring want in the face.

Four years of imperialistic slaughter have left their trace. Irrefutably and clearly events have shown to the people that both imperialistic groups, the English as well as the German, have been playing false. The four years of war have shown in their effects the great law of capitalism in all wars; that he who is richest and mightiest profits the most,

takes the greatest share of the spoils, while he who is weakest is exploited, martyred, oppressed and outraged to the utmost.

In the number of its colonial possessions, English imperialism has always been more powerful than any of the other countries. England has lost not a span of its "acquired" land. On the other hand it has acquired control of all German colonies in Africa, has occupied Mesopotamia and Palestine.

German imperialism was stronger because of the wonderful organization and ruthless discipline of "its" armies, but as far as colonies are concerned, is much weaker than its opponent. It has now lost all of its colonies, but has robbed half of Europe and throttled most of the small countries and weaker peoples. What a high conception of "liberation" on either side! How well they have defended their fatherlands, these "gentlemen" of both groups, the Anglo-French and the German capitalists together with their lackeys, the Social-Patriots.

American plutocrats are wealthier than those of any other country partly because they are geographically more favorably situated. They have made the greatest profits. They have made all, even the weakest countries, their debtors. They have amassed gigantic fortunes during the war. And every dollar is stained with the blood that was shed by millions of murdered and crippled men, shed in the high, honorable and holy war of freedom.

Had the Anglo-French and American bourgeoisie accepted the Soviet invitation to participate in peace

negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, instead of leaving Russia to the mercy of brutal Germany a just peace without annexations and indemnities, a peace based upon complete equality could have been forced upon Germany, and millions of lives might have been saved. Because they hoped to re-establish the Eastern Front by once more drawing us into the whirlpool of warfare, they refused to attend peace negotiations and gave Germany a free hand to cram its shameful terms down the throat of the Russian people. It lay in the power of the Allied countries to make the Brest-Litovsk negotiations the forerunner of a general peace. It ill becomes them to throw the blame for the Russo-German peace upon our shoulders!

The workers of the whole world, in whatever country they may live, rejoice with us and sympathize with us, applaud us for having burst the iron ring of imperialistic agreements and treaties, for having dreaded no sacrifice, however great, to free ourselves, for having established ourselves as a socialist republic, even so rent asunder and plundered by German imperialists, for having raised the banner of peace, the banner of Socialism over the world. What wonder that we are hated by the capitalist class the world over. But this hatred of imperialism and the sympathy of the class-conscious workers of all countries give us assurance of the righteousness of our cause.

He is no Socialist who cannot understand that one cannot and must not hesitate to bring even that

greatest of sacrifice, the sacrifice of territory, that one must be ready to accept even military defeat at the hands of imperialism in the interests of victory over the bourgeoisie, in the interests of a transfer of power to the working-class. For the sake of "their" cause, that is for the conquest of world-power, the imperialists of England and Germany have not hesitated to ruin a whole row of nations, from Belgium and Servia to Palestine and Mesopotamia. Shall we then hesitate to act in the name of the liberation of the workers of the world from the yoke of capitalism, in the name of a general honorable peace; shall we wait until we can find a way that entails no sacrifice; shall we be afraid to begin the fight until an easy victory is assured; shall we place the integrity and safety of this "fatherland" created by the bourgeoisie over the interests of the international socialist revolution?

We have been attacked for coming to terms with German militarism. Is there no difference between a pact entered upon by Socialists and a bourgeoisie (native or foreign) against the working class, against labor, and an agreement that is made between a working class that has overthrown its own bourgeoisie and a bourgeoisie of one side against a bourgeoisie of another nationality for the protection of the proletariat? Shall we not exploit the antagonism that exists between the various groups of the bourgeoisie? In reality every European understands this difference, and the American people, as I will presently show, have had a very similar experience

in its own history. There are agreements and agreements, *fagots et fagots*, as the Frenchman says.

When the robber-barons of German imperialism threw their armies into defenseless, demobilized Russia in February, 1918, when Russia had staked its hopes upon the international solidarity of the proletariat before the international revolution had completely ripened, I did not hesitate for a moment to come to certain agreements with French Monarchs. The French captain Sadoul, who sympathized in words with the Bolsheviks while in deeds he was the faithful servant of French imperialism, brought the French officer de Lubersac to me. "I am a Monarchist. My only purpose is the overthrow of Germany," de Lubersac declared to me. "That is self-understood (*cela va sans dire*)," I replied. But this by no means prevented me from coming to an understanding with de Lubersac concerning certain services that French experts in explosives were ready to render in order to hold up the German advance by the destruction of railroad lines. This is an example of the kind of agreement that every class-conscious worker must be ready to adopt, an agreement in the interest of Socialism. We shook hands with the French Monarchs although we knew that each one of us would rather have seen the other hang. But temporarily our interests were identical. To throw back the rapacious advancing German army we made use of the equally greedy interests of their opponents, thereby serving

the interests of the Russian and the international socialist revolution.

In this way we furthered the cause of the working class of Russia and of other countries; in this way we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the world by making use of the usual and absolutely legal practice of maneuvering, shifting and waiting for the moment the rapidly growing proletarian revolution in the more highly developed nations had ripened.

Long ago the American people used these tactics to the advantage of its revolution. When America waged its great war of liberation against the English oppressors, it likewise entered into negotiations with other oppressors, with the French and the Spaniards who at that time owned a considerable portion of what is now the United States. In its desperate struggle for freedom the American people made "agreements" with one group of oppressors against the other for the purpose of weakening all oppressors and strengthening those who were struggling against tyranny. The American people utilized the antagonism that existed between the English and the French, at times even fighting side by side with the armies of one group of oppressors, the French and the Spanish against the others, the English. Thus it vanquished first the English and then freed itself (partly by purchase) from the dangerous proximity of the French and Spanish possessions.

The great Russian revolutionist Tchernychewski once said: "Political activity is not as smooth as the

pavement of the Nevski Prospect." He is no revolutionist who would have the revolution of the proletariat only under the "condition" that it proceed smoothly and in an orderly manner, that guarantees against defeat be given beforehand, that the revolution go forward along the broad, free, straight path to victory, that there shall not be here and there the heaviest sacrifices, that we shall not have to lie in wait in besieged fortresses, shall not have to climb up along the narrowest path, the most impassible, winding, dangerous mountain roads. He is no revolutionist, he has not yet freed himself from the pedantry of bourgeois intellectualism, he will fall back, again and again, into the camp of the counter revolutionary bourgeoisie.

They are little more than imitators of the bourgeoisie, these gentlemen who delight in holding up to us the "chaos" of revolution, the "destruction" of industry, the unemployment, the lack of food. Can there be anything more hypocritical than such accusations from people who greeted and supported the imperialistic war and made common cause with Kerensky when he continued the war? Is not this imperialistic war the cause of all our misfortune? The revolution that was born by the war must necessarily go on through the terrible difficulties and sufferings that war created, through this heritage of destruction and reactionary mass murder. To accuse us of "destruction" of industries and "terror" is hypocrisy or clumsy pedantry, shows an incapability of understanding the most elemental fundamentals

of the raging, climatic force of the class struggle, called Revolution.

In words our accusers "recognize" this kind of class struggle, in deeds they revert again and again to the middle-class utopia of "class harmony" and the mutual "interdependence" of classes upon one another. In reality the class struggle in revolutionary times has always inevitably taken on the form of civil war, and civil war is unthinkable without the worst kind of destruction, without terror and limitations of form of democracy in the interests of the war. One must be a sickly sentimentalist not to be able to see, to understand and appreciate this necessity. Only the Tchecov type of the lifeless "Man in the Box" can denounce the Revolution for this reason instead of throwing himself into the fight with the whole vehemence and decision of his soul at a moment when history demands that the highest problems of humanity be solved by struggle and war.

The best representatives of the American proletariat—those representatives who have repeatedly given expression to their full solidarity with us, the Bolsheviks, are the expression of this revolutionary tradition in the life of the American people. This tradition originated in the war of liberation against the English in the 18th and the Civil War in the 19th century. Industry and commerce in 1870 were in a much worse position than in 1860. But where can you find an American so pedantic, so absolutely idiotic, who would deny the revolutionary and pro-

gressive significance of the American Civil War of 1860-1865?

The representatives of the bourgeoisie understand very well that the overthrow of slavery was well worth the three years of Civil War, the depth of destruction, devastation and terror that were its accompaniment. But these same gentlemen and the reform socialists who have allowed themselves to be cowed by the bourgeoisie and tremble at the thought of a revolution, cannot, nay will not, see the necessity and righteousness of a civil war in Russia, though it is facing a far greater task, the work of abolishing capitalist wage slavery and overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The American working class will not follow the lead of its bourgeoisie. It will go with us against the bourgeoisie. The whole history of the American people gives me this confidence, this conviction. I recall with pride the words of one of the best loved leaders of the American proletariat, Eugene V. Debs, who said in the *Appeal to Reason* at the end of 1915, when it was still a socialist paper, in an article entitled "Why Should I Fight?" that he would rather be shot than vote for war credits to support the present criminal and reactionary war, that he knows only one war that is sanctified and justified from the standpoint of the proletariat: the war against the capitalist class, the war for the liberation of mankind from wage slavery. I am not surprised that this fearless man was thrown into prison by the American bourgeoisie. Let them brutalize

true internationalists, the real representatives of the revolutionary proletariat. The greater the bitterness and brutality they sow, the nearer is the day of the victorious proletarian revolution.

We are accused of having brought devastation upon Russia. Who is it that makes these accusations? The train-bearers of the bourgeoisie, of that same bourgeoisie that almost completely destroyed the culture of Europe, that has dragged the whole continent back to barbarism, that has brought hunger and destruction to the world. This bourgeoisie now demands that we find a different basis for our Revolution than that of destruction, that we shall not build it up upon the ruins of war, with human beings degraded and brutalized by years of warfare. O, how human, how just is this bourgeoisie!

Its servants charge us with the use of terroristic methods.—Have the English forgotten their 1649, the French their 1793? Terror was just and justified when it was employed by the bourgeoisie for its own purposes against feudal domination. But terror becomes criminal when workingmen and poverty-stricken peasants dare to use it against the bourgeoisie. Terror was just and justified when it was used to put one exploiting minority in the place of another. But terror becomes horrible and criminal when it is used to abolish all exploiting minorities, when it is employed in the cause of the actual majority, in the cause of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat, of the working class and the poor peasantry.

The bourgeoisie of international imperialism has succeeded in slaughtering 10 millions, in crippling 20 millions in its war. Should our war, the war of the oppressed and the exploited, against oppressors and exploiters, cost a half or a whole million victims in all countries, the bourgeoisie would still maintain that the victims of the world war died a righteous death, that those of the civil war were sacrificed for a criminal cause.

But the proletariat, even now, in the midst of the horrors of war, is learning the great truth that all revolutions teach, the truth that has been handed down to us by our best teachers, the founders of modern Socialism. From them we have learned that a successful revolution is inconceivable unless it breaks the resistance of the exploiting class. When the workers and the laboring peasants took hold of the powers of state, it became our duty to quell the resistance of the exploiting class. We are proud that we have done it, that we are doing it. We only regret that we did not do it, at the beginning, with sufficient firmness and decision.

We realize that the mad resistance of the bourgeoisie against the socialist revolution in all countries is unavoidable. We know, too, that with the development of this revolution this resistance will grow. But the proletariat will break down this resistance and in the course of its struggle against the bourgeoisie the proletariat will finally become ripe for victory and power.

Let the corrupt bourgeois press trumpet every
21

mistake that is made by our Revolution out into the world. We are not afraid of our mistakes. The beginning of the revolution has not sanctified humanity. It is not to be expected that the working classes who had been exploited and forcibly held down by the clutches of want, of ignorance and degradation for centuries should conduct its revolution without mistakes. The dead body of bourgeois society cannot simply be put into a coffin and buried. It rots in our midst, poisons the air we breathe, pollutes our lives, clings to the new, the fresh, the living with a thousand threads and tendrils of old customs, of death and decay.

But for every hundred of our mistakes that are heralded into the world by the bourgeoisie and its sycophants, there are ten thousand great deeds of heroism, greater and more heroic because they seem so simple and unpretentious, because they take place in the everyday life of the factory districts or in secluded villages, because they are the deeds of people who are not in the habit of proclaiming their every success to the world, who have no opportunity to do so.

But even if the contrary were true,—I know, of course, that this is not so—but even if we had committed 10,000 mistakes to every 100 wise and righteous deeds, yes, even then our revolution would be great and invincible. And it will go down in the history of the world as unconquerable. For the first time in the history of the world not the minority, not alone the rich and the educated, but the real masses, the huge majority of the working class it-

self, are building up a new world, are deciding the most difficult questions of social organization from out of their own experience.

Every mistake that is made in this work, in this honestly conscientious co-operation of ten million plain workingmen and peasants in the recreation of their entire lives—every such mistake is worth thousands and millions of “faultless” successes of the exploiting minority, in outwitting and taking advantage of the laboring masses. For only through these mistakes can the workers and peasants learn to organize their new existence, to get along without the capitalist class. Only thus will they be able to blaze their way, through thousands of hindrances to victorious socialism.

Mistakes are being made by our peasants who, at one stroke, in the night from October 25 to October 26 (Russian Calendar), 1917, did away with all private ownership of land, and are now struggling, from month to month, under the greatest difficulties, to correct their own mistakes, trying to solve in practice the most difficult problems of organizing a new social state, fighting against profiteers to secure the possession of the land for the worker instead of for the speculator, to carry on agricultural production under a system of communist farming on a large scale.

Mistakes are being made by our workmen in their revolutionary activity, who, in a few short months, have placed practically all of the larger factories and workers under state ownership, and are now

learning, from day to day, under the greatest difficulties, to conduct the management of entire industries, to reorganize industries already organized, to overcome the deadly resistance of laziness and middle-class reaction and egotism. Stone upon stone they are building the foundation for a new social community, the self-discipline of labor, the new rule of the labor organizations of the working class over their members.

Mistakes are being made in their revolutionary activity by the Soviets which were first created in 1905 by the gigantic upheaval of the masses. The Workmen's and Peasants' Soviets are a new type of state, a new highest form of Democracy, a particular form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a mode of conducting the business of the state without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie. For the first time democracy is placed at the service of the masses, of the workers, and ceases to be a democracy for the rich, as it is, in the last analysis, in all capitalist, yes, in all democratic republics. For the first time the masses of the people, in a nation of hundreds of millions, are fulfilling the task of realizing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat, without which socialism is not to be thought of.

Let incurable pedants, crammed full of bourgeois democratic and parliamentary prejudices, shake their heads gravely over our Soviets, let them deplore the fact that we have no direct elections. These people have forgotten nothing, have learned

nothing in the great upheaval of 1914-1918. The combination of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the new democracy of the proletariat, of civil war with the widest application of the masses to political problems, such a combination cannot be achieved in a day, cannot be forced into the battered forms of formal parliamentary democratism. In the Soviet Republic there arises before us a new world, the world of Socialism. Such a world cannot be materialized as if by magic, complete in every detail, as Minerva sprang from Jupiter's head.

While the old bourgeoisie democratic constitutions, for instance, proclaimed formal equality and the right of free assemblage, the constitution of the Soviet Republic repudiates the hypocrisy of a formal equality of all human beings. When the bourgeoisie republicans overturned feudal thrones, they did not recognize the rules of formal equality of monarchists. Since we here are concerned with the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, only fools or traitors will insist on the formal equality of the bourgeoisie. The right of free assemblage is not worth an iota to the workman and to the peasant when all better meeting places are in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Our Soviets have taken over all usable buildings in the cities and towns out of the hands of the rich and have placed them at the disposal of the workmen and peasants for meeting and organization purposes. That is how our right of assemblage looks—for the workers. That is the meaning and content of our Soviet, of our socialist constitution.

And for this reason we are all firmly convinced that the Soviet Republic, whatever misfortune may still lie in store for it, is unconquerable.

It is unconquerable because every blow that comes from the powers of madly raging imperialism, every new attack by the international bourgeoisie will bring new, and hitherto unaffected strata of workingmen and peasants into the fight, will educate them at the cost of the greatest sacrifice, making them hard as steel, awakening a new heroism in the masses.

We know that it may take a long time before help can come from you, comrades, American Workingmen, for the development of the revolution in the different countries proceeds along various paths, with varying rapidity (how could it be otherwise!). We know full well that the outbreak of the European proletarian revolution may take many weeks to come, quickly as it is ripening in these days. We are counting on the inevitability of the international revolution. But that does not mean that we count upon its coming at some definite, nearby date. We have experienced two great revolutions in our own country, that of 1905 and that of 1917, and we know that revolutions cannot come either at a word of command or according to prearranged plans. We know that circumstances alone have pushed us, the proletariat of Russia, forward, that we have reached this new state in the social life of the world not because of our superiority but because of the peculiarly reactionary character of Russia. But until the out-

break of the international revolution, revolutions in individual countries may still meet with a number of serious setbacks and overthrows.

And yet we are certain that we are invincible, for if humanity will not emerge from this imperialistic massacre broken in spirit, it will triumph. Ours was the first country to break the chains of imperialistic warfare. We broke them with the greatest sacrifice, but they are broken. We stand outside of imperialistic duties and considerations, we have raised the banner of the fight for the complete overthrow of imperialism for the world.

We are in a beleaguered fortress, so long as no other international socialist revolution comes to our assistance with its armies. But these armies exist, they are stronger than ours, they grow, they strive, they become more invincible the longer imperialism with its brutalities continues. Workingmen the world over are breaking with their betrayers, with their Gompers and their Scheidemanns. Inevitably labor is approaching communistic Bolshevik tactics, is preparing for the proletarian revolution that alone is capable of preserving culture and humanity from destruction.

We are invincible, for invincible is the Proletarian Revolution.

MESSAGE FROM NIKOLAI LENIN TO WORKERS OF GREAT BRITAIN

(From *Chicago Socialist*, July 10, 1920)

NOTE.—When the delegates of the British Trade Unions, the British Labor Party and the British Independent Labor Party returned home after their recent visit to Soviet Russia, they carried with them a message from Nikolai Lenin to the workers of Great Britain. This message was published in the British Socialist press and through these publications comes to the United States. With a few changes the message could just as appropriately have been addressed to the workers of the United States. It is as follows:

COMRADES:

First of all permit me to thank you for sending your Delegation with the object of acquainting itself with Soviet Russia.

When your delegation proposed to me to despatch through its intermediary a letter to the British Workers and perhaps also a proposal to the British Government, I answered that I gratefully accepted the first suggestion but that to the Government I must address myself not through the Labor delegation but directly on behalf of our Government, through Comrade Tchitcherine.

We have in this way addressed ourselves many times to the British Government with the most formal and solemn proposal to start peace negotiations.

These proposals are still being made unintermittently by Comrade Litvinoff and Comrade Krassin and all our other representatives.

The British Government consistently does not accept our proposals.

It is therefore not surprising that with the Delegation of British Workers I should want to speak solely as with a delega-

tion of workers, and not in my capacity as a representative of the Government of Soviet Russia, but in the capacity of an ordinary Communist.

I was not surprised to find that the viewpoint of some of the members of your Delegation does not coincide with that of the working class but coincides with the viewpoint of the bourgeoisie, the class of exploiters.

This is because in all capitalist countries the imperialist war has again exposed the inveterate absecess, namely, the desertion of the majority of parliamentary and trade union leaders of the workers to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

Under the oblique pretense of the "defense of the country" actually defending the spoliatory interests of one of the two groups of the world bandits, the Anglo-French-American or the German group, they entered into an alliance with the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat; they covered up this treason with sentimental shopkeepers reformist and pacifist phrases about peaceful evolution, about constitutional measures, about democracy, etc.

This was the case in all countries. It is not surprising that this very tendency existing in England has found expression in the composition of your Delegation.

Shaw and Guest, members of your Delegation, were obviously surprised and hurt by my statement that England, notwithstanding the declarations of her Government, continues her intervention, is carrying on a war against us, helping Wrangel in the Crimea and the White Guards in Poland.

And they asked me whether I have proofs to this effect, whether I can state how many trains with munitions were delivered by England to Poland, etc.

I replied that for the purpose of getting access to the secret agreements of the British Government it is necessary to overthrow it by revolutionary means and to lay hold of all documents of its foreign policy as was done by us in 1917.

Every educated person, everyone genuinely interested in politics, knew even before the revolution that the Czar had secret treaties with the robber governments of England, France, the

United States, Italy, Japan, for the partition of booty about Constantinople, Galicia, Armenia, Syria, Mesopotamia, etc.

Only liars and hypocrites (excepting, of course, quite ignorant and illiterate people) could deny this or pretend not to know it.

But without revolution we would never be able to get the secret documents of the robber governments of the capitalist class.

Those leaders or representatives of the British proletariat—whether they be parliamentarians, trade unionists, journalists or other people—who pretend that they are ignorant of the existence of secret treaties of England, France, the United States, Italy, Japan, and Poland, for the plundering of other countries for partition of booty and who do not carry on a revolutionary struggle for the exposure of such treaties show thereby needlessly once again that they are faithful servants of the capitalists.

We knew this long ago, we are exposing this both here and in all other countries of the world.

The visit to Russia of a delegation of British workers will accelerate the exposure of such leaders in England as well.

My above-mentioned interview with members of your Delegation took place on May 26th.

A day later we received radios, saying that Bonar Law conceded in the British Parliament that military help was rendered to Poland in October "for the defense against Russia" (of course, only for defense, only in October! In England there are still "influential labor leaders" helping the capitalists to deceive the workers!), while the periodical, *The New Statesman*, one of the most moderate of all moderate middle-class newspapers or periodicals, wrote about the new tanks being shipped from England to Poland, more powerful than those used during the war against the Germans.

Is it possible then not to laugh at those "leaders" of the British workers who, with an air of hurt innocence, are asking what "proofs" there are that England is making war on Russia and is helping Poland and the White Guards in Crimea?

Members of the Delegation have asked me what I think to be of greater importance, whether the formation in England of

a consistent revolutionary communist party, or immediate help of the working masses in England to the cause of peace with Russia.

I replied that the answer to this question depends upon the convictions of those who give the answer.

Genuine partisans of the liberation of the workers from the yoke of capital cannot possibly oppose the foundation of a communist party that alone is able to educate the working masses, not after the bourgeois and shopkeeper fashion, that alone is able actually to expose, deride, and disgrace "leaders" who are capable of doubting whether England is helping Poland, etc.

It need not be apprehended that there will be in England too many communists, as even a small communist party is not existent there.

But if anyone persists still in intellectual slavery under the bourgeoisie and continues to share the middle-class prejudice concerning "democracy" (bourgeois democracy!), pacifism, etc., then, of course, such people could only injure the proletariat to an even greater extent should it occur to them to call themselves communists and to join the Third International.

Such people are not capable of anything except the adoption of "sweetened resolutions" against intervention which are made up merely of shopkeepers' phrases.

In a certain respect these resolutions are useful inasmuch as the "old leaders" (the partisans of bourgeois democracy, peaceful methods, etc., etc.) will make themselves ridiculous in the eyes of the masses, exposing themselves the sooner the more resolutions they pass, which, being empty and non-committal, are unattended by revolutionary action.

To everyone his due; let the communists work directly through their party for the enlightenment of the revolutionary consciousness of the workers.

Let those who supported the "defense of the country" during the imperialistic war for the partition of the world, who supported the "defense" of the secret treaty of English capitalists with the Czar for the plundering of Turkey, let those who "are ignorant" of the help to Poland and the White Guards in Russia

rendered by Great Britain, let them quicker bring up to a ludicrous figure the number of their "pacifist resolutions." The sooner they will share the fate of Kerensky, the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists in Russia.

Some of the members of your delegation have asked me with surprise concerning red terror, about the lack of the freedom of the press, about the lack of freedom of assembly, about our persecution of Mensheviks and Menshevik workers, etc.

I replied that the real culprits of the terror are the imperialists of England and her "Allies," who have been and are conducting white terror in Finland and Hungary, in India and Ireland, who have been and are supporting Yudenitch, Kolchak, Denikin, Pilsudsky, and Wrangel.

Our red terror is a defense of the working class against the exploiters; it is the suppression of the resistance of the exploiters with whom the Social-Revolutionists, the Mensheviks, and an insignificant number of Menshevik workers align themselves.

The freedom of the press and assembly in a bourgeois democracy is tantamount to the freedom of the well-to-do to plot against the working people.

It means freedom of bribing and buying up newspapers by the capitalists. I have so often explained this in the press that it was not very entertaining to me to repeat myself.

However, two days after my interview with your delegates the newspapers published a despatch saying that in addition to the arrests of Monatte and Loriot in France, Sylvia Pankhurst has been arrested in England.

This is the best answer of the British Government to the question which the non-communist "leaders" of British workers, captivated by bourgeois prejudices, are even afraid to ask, namely the question, against which class is the terror directed.

Whether against the oppressed and exploited, or against the oppressors and exploiters; whether it is a question of affording "freedom" to the capitalist to plunder, defraud, stupefy the working people, or whether the working people are to be "free" from the yoke of capitalists, speculators, property holders.

Comrade Sylvia Pankhurst is the representative of the in-

terests of hundreds of millions of people who are oppressed by British and other capitalists and it is on this account that she becomes an object of the white terror and is deprived of freedom.

The same "leaders" of workers who are conducting a non-communist policy are ninety-nine per cent representatives of the bourgeoisie, of its deceit, of its prejudices.

In conclusion, I once more thank you, comrades, for sending us your delegation.

The fact of its getting acquainted with Soviet Russia, notwithstanding the hostility of many of them towards the Soviet system and the dictatorship of the proletariat, notwithstanding the fact that it is to an extraordinary extent in the captivity of bourgeois prejudices, will unavoidably result in accelerating the failure of capitalism of the whole world.

NIKOLAI LENIN.

Moscow, *May 30, 1920.*

TROTZKY'S SPEECH TO THE PETROGRAD SOVIET

(From N. Y. *Call*, April 18, 1919)

[LITTLE's *Living Age*, for April, 1919, carries an address delivered by Trotzky to the Petrograd Soviet. Here is presented to American readers a picture of the struggle of the Soviet republic of Russia to preserve the revolution. It is quite different from the usual run of "news" coming from that country.]

COMRADES:

Two months and a half ago I made a speech here to the Petrograd Soviet and the Congress of Soviets of the Northern Territory. It was just after we had surrendered Siberia to the Czechoslovaks and the White Guards, and a few days before we surrendered Kazan, one of the saddest moments in the history of our young Soviet republic, that I came to you from Moscow, where it was decided, at a meeting of the Soviet of the People's Commissioners, and at party meetings, at a time of danger—grave danger to the Soviet republic—to return here where this republic was born, to return to Red Petrograd and say to the Petrograd workmen, to the Petrograd Soviet, "The threatening hour of trial has come, and we await support from you." I remember, and you all remember, that the Petrograd Soviet then unanimously, with true, inmost enthusiasm, which bore witness to its determination, responded to the appeal, and sent hundreds, many hundreds, of the best sons of Petrograd's

working class to the front. I was on the Eastern front with them during that month when we were trying to take Kazan, and I watched your representative workingmen, the Comrades from Petrograd.

If we took Kazan, if we took Simbirsk, if we cleared the Volga, it was, in an enormous degree, thanks to those workers whom we sent from here. They created our army there under the enemy's fire. We only sent the raw material there, young men, unconsolidated forces. The living soul had to be poured into them. They had to be welded together, they had to be given self-confidence, a united, centralized command had to be created. The personnel for the command had to be attracted; and, where political control was needed over them, authoritative workers were wanted who would be a guaranty to our soldiers that those in command would not deceive them or bring them into trouble. All this was done by representatives of the Petrograd working-class. You took Kazan, you took Simbirsk, you cleared the Volga, you, the Petrograd Soviet of Workmen's and Red Army Deputies. I told you then that, in our War Department, there was no doubt that we could create a strong, forcible, compact army, and a strong navy, perhaps not numerous for the time, while we are cut short in what we can do at sea, but a navy which can be developed when international conditions make that possible, and international conditions are changing every day in our favor. We have created a river flotilla on the Volga, where, as I remarked at our meeting here yesterday, our sailors have fought, and are fighting, with incomparable heroism. Some vessels of the Baltic fleet, of course only the smaller fighting units, have been transferred there with first-class hardened, revolutionary crews. There the White Guards are retreating down the Volga and on the Kama, and have surrendered the mouth of the Byelaya. In these battles perished, as I have mentioned, one of the best representatives of the Baltic fleet, Nikolai Grigoryevich Markin, the founder of our Volga flotilla, second in command to Comrade Raskolnikov.

We created a Red air-fleet. This is the most delicate form of

armament: among the airmen were many elements demoralized by the old Grand Ducal regime, and the profession itself was very aristocratic. The airmen do not live as a corporate body (artel), but as individuals, and many of them look down on the army. We were told: "You will not have an air-fleet; they will fly over to the enemy." There were cases in which they flew over with their machines; there were cases here on the northern front where airmen deserters were caught, and, of course, shot, but I must say that these were isolated cases; they might create a false impression among you as to the actual feeling in our Red air-fleet. We had many heroes in our Red army, among the infantry and cavalry, and among the sailors, but if you obliged me to award the palm of eminence to anyone, I should say that the airmen held the first place in the battles around Kazan. They knew no danger, and they were engaged there under the most incredible conditions. They undertook reconnaissances of the utmost importance in storm and by night; they established a liaison service and terrorized the enemy by ruthless bombardment.

There fell into our hands the diary of an intelligent White-Guard woman, who lived through all this month of strife in Kazan, and there on every page the work of the Red bandits of the air—that means our airmen—is spoken of with horror and hatred. And now they have been spread out on all the fronts: on the Southern front against the Cossacks our Red airmen will shortly display their strength. I wanted to tell you that our Red army is spreading itself in all directions, upward as well. We shall establish a durable, centralized, strong apparatus, morally sound at heart, because the Red army is bound together by that unity of feeling which the revolutionary representatives of the Petrograd and Moscow proletariat have brought into it. Literally, regiments who came from the villages and were but little educated or enlightened have, in the course of two or three weeks, been morally regenerated under the influence of leading workmen. I remember one group. The picture just now came up before my eyes. It was one of the saddest and most tragic nights before Kazan, when raw young forces retired in a panic.

That was in August, in the first half, when we suffered reverses. A detachment of Communists arrived: there were over 50 of them, 56, I think. Among them were such as had never had a rifle in their hands before that day. There were men of 40 or more, but the majority were boys of 18, 19, or 20. I remember how one such smoothfaced 18-year-old Petrograd Communist appeared at headquarters at night, rifle in hand, and told us how a regiment had deserted its position and they had taken its place, and he said: "We are Communards." From this detachment of 50 men, 12 returned, but, Comrades, they created an army, these Petrograd and Moscow workmen, who went to abandoned positions in detachments of 50 or 60 men and returned 12 in number. They perished nameless, as the majority of heroes of the working class generally do. Our problem and duty is to endeavor to re-establish their names in the memory of the working class. Many perished there, and they are no longer known by name, but they made for us that Red army which defends Soviet Russia and defends the conquests of the working class, that citadel, that fortress of the international revolution which our Soviet Russia now represents. From that time, Comrades, our position became, as you know, incomparably better on the Eastern front, where the danger was the greatest, for the Czechoslovaks and White Guards, moving forward from Simbirsk to Kazan, threatened us with a movement on Nijny in one direction, and, in another, with one toward Vologda, Yaroslav, and Archangel, to join up with the Anglo-French expedition. That is why our chief efforts were directed to the Eastern front, and these efforts gave a good result. The Volga has now been cleared from its source to its mouth. And if the Krasnov bands did attempt to cut in again between Tsaritsyn, Svetly Yar, and Sarepta, well, as you know, this effort was crushed by our Steppe army, which overthrew Krasnov's numerous forces, overthrew the maneuvering battalion of officers, took the staff prisoner, seized all the artillery, and, according to the latest information, was pursuing the troops that were fleeing in panic in all directions. The Volga has been freed at Samara and Syzran, and our affairs on the Ural are going in-

comparably better than before, for, on the Volga, we have freed important forces that are moving far on to the east. On the Ural we have approached Orenburg and Ufa after taking Bugulma. The fall of Ufa and Orenburg is certain in the near future, and Ekaterinburg's fate is a foregone conclusion.

It is true that while advancing to the east we lengthen our communications, and this always makes more difficulty. But we must take into consideration the fact that while advancing to the east we are seizing important military bases, for the enemy is retiring everywhere in a panic and is leaving at our disposal enormous military stores, and, what is more important, valuable works which serve for the production of munitions. The result is that not only we, but our military bases, are advancing, and our military position is improving, not becoming more difficult.

Archangel and the Murmansk front represented a great danger for us until we became convinced that that expedition could not join hands with the Czecho-Slovaks and the White Guards on the Volga and on the Ural. This danger may now be regarded as past. It is true that in their communiquees the White Guards say that they have evacuated Kazan, Simbirsk, Volsk, Khvalynsk, Syzran and Samara for strategic reasons. We, of course, cannot make any objection to all this dirt having cleared out of the territory of the Soviet republic for strategic reasons connected with their operations. But I remember how, when they tried to surround our army in Sviyajsk, they brought from Samara and Simbirsk some officers' maneuvering battalions from newly mobilized regiments. Sakinkov, Fortunatov, and Lebedev marched at the head of these troops to crush our forces that were struggling near Kazan. They were driven off, suffered a defeat, and issued a communique for the White Guard population: "We fulfilled our task, we retired in complete order in the full sense of the expression." This was not a strategical maneuver, but something else—like the panic-stricken retreat of whipped hounds. So that there is no ground to fear that these two fronts will be joined up. And once this is so, then the Archangel front, to which we, of course, must give our full attention, ceases to be threatening, at any rate for the near future, during the winter

months. The White Sea will soon freeze, and communication between the expedition and the English metropolis will be interrupted.

They will have to retire to the Murmansk coast that does not freeze. But it will not be difficult for us in this land of starvation, cut off from England by ice, to crush the English expedition with small forces. There remains the southern front, and to it I direct all the attention of the Petrograd Workmen's and Red Army Deputies' Soviet. It is quite natural that, here, you concentrated all your attention on the northern and northeastern fronts, sent your best forces thither and were occupied in sustaining, morally and physically, the forces despatched to those parts.

And now, Comrades, we are living in times when the lines of international politics are changing their course with immense, with catastrophic swiftness. England thought Savinkov's White Guards were stronger than they proved to be. In the French legation and in the French embassy [sic] I was told that the former French Ambassador, Noulens, just before the Yaroslav revolt summoned Savinkov and told him that on such and such a date he must raise a revolt in Yaroslav. Savinkov answered that this was a hopeless affair. Noulens, in reply, showed him that they must join hands with the Czechoslovaks, whose armies were already disintegrating, and therefore, Savinkov's help was essential. Noulens formulated it in this way: "We do not give millions to your organizations in order that you should refuse to do what we want and when we want it." And then Savinkov organized the Yaroslav revolt.

At that time we were weak, but, nevertheless, the Yaroslav revolt was crushed and all the Entente missions were swept out of Vologda. A strict revolutionary regime was set up there, the counter-revolutionary plots were cut off, and the northern operations of the Franco-English Imperialists were uprooted.

They are now turning all their attention to the south, not only because they have suffered defeat in the north and northeast, but, first of all, because, for the time being, the interrelation of forces has changed. Germany, having brought into sub-

jection the Balkan peninsula, Rumania, the Ukraine, and Trans-Caucasia, was trying to effect a dictatorship in the Northern Caucasus.

Now the situation has radically changed, and the Anglo-French and American plunderers have discounted this to begin with. The orientation is now changing in all the Balkan countries. Previously, they were the vassals, the mercenaries, of Germany; now they are making ready to become within 24 hours, or 24 minutes if required, the subject or half-willing vassals and mercenaries of Anglo-French imperialism. This has already happened in Bulgaria, it is happening in Turkey, it may happen to-morrow in Rumania, and it has been for a long time in preparation in the Ukraine. To the land-owning and bourgeois classes there, it makes no difference whether Skoropadskyism is on a German or an Anglo-French basis. The Ukraine knows that she cannot expect thanks from Skoropadsky, that he will sell Ukrainian land and Ukrainian grain to Germany just as he would to the Anglo-French imperialists.

Then, the Caucasus, too, at present is a place where the endeavors of English imperialism and the weakening endeavors of German imperialism are at cross purposes. Baku was seized by the Turks, but there is reason to think that it will pass to-morrow into the hands of the English. After Baku it will be Astrakhan's turn, and then that of Cis-Caucasia. The Krasnovites, who at present are shooting German ammunition from German rifles, will to-morrow aim all their artillery according to the dictates of English imperialism. Krasnov will carry out these measures without hesitation and in this will unite with Denikin, who continues to carry on Alexeyev's business.

Just now, Comrades, the chief danger threatens us, not from the north and not from the east: this is a more distant danger; the months of this winter will roll by and the spring that follows must come before the danger from the Archangel side becomes a real one, or the Japanese can move their divisions toward old Ural, if their warlike imperialistic pretensions go so far.

The danger in the south is much more immediate; if the Straits are opened by England's and France's fleets, if an Anglo-

French expedition appears on the shores of the Black Sea, this will mean a radical change of Krasnov's front, a change of the whole of Southern Russia, on the signal of danger from the Anglo-French mercenary bands, supported by Russian White Guard bands; this means a blow at Soviet Russia from the south.

Germany is too weak just now to be a menace to us. England and France account themselves sufficiently strong still; they are at present passing through such a period as that which Germany passed through during the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, and the conclusion of the treaty.

Germany needed six months to fall a victim to her own crimes. England and France, who reached their culmination six months after Germany, require perhaps six or eight weeks, because history works at a feverish rate, and because the patience of the popular masses is being the more exhausted and indications of a catastrophe are visible in imperialistic politics.

It may be hoped that in a few months, and it may be in a few weeks, the Anglo-French will be weaker than at present, but in the next few weeks they are an immediate and menacing enemy to us. This enemy threatens in a much greater degree from the south than from the north, therefore, all our attention must be directed toward the south. Our first and chief problem is not to allow Krasnov to cross the front, nor to give him an opportunity to join hands with the Anglo-French and receive military support from them.

How is this to be achieved? It is very simple; Krasnov's and all these bands must be wiped off the face of the earth in the next two or three weeks. The Ukraine, as you know, during her negotiation with us, refused to define the frontier with us and stated that it was the territory of the Don Republic there and this did not concern Soviet Russia. Now when we clear the Don Republic of the Krasnov bands, we shall have no frontier with the Ukraine; she herself did not want to have this frontier, and we will seek it in conjunction with the Ukrainian workmen and peasants. The evacuation of the Don territory will be a death blow to all the Ukrainian bourgeoisie and to both of the

counter-revolutions to the already waning German scheme, because this will be the ruin of Krasnov, to whom Skoropadsky appealed for military help in establishing Ukrainian Cossackdom; it will also be ruin to the Anglo-French scheme, because it reckoned on Krasnov for the best reasons. In this way it will be a death blow to the whole Ukrainian counter-revolution. There can be no doubt that, when the Red Army regiments enter Rostov and Novocherkask, Soviet barricades will be erected in the streets of Kiev and Odessa. A revolution in the Ukraine which, of course, we do not regard with indifference—and we shall occupy the post that becomes Soviet Russia—means a mighty concussion for Rumania and the whole Balkan peninsula. Austria, which is now too closely bound up with the Ukraine, if only from the fact that Austrian, as well as German, troops are quartered there, is being more and more drawn into the rapids of the Ukrainian revolution. The knot of European imperialism, or even of world imperialism, is tied in the south of Russia, and especially on the Don front. The knot of the European revolution is tied there, together with it, at present, and this knot we must cut in the shortest possible time. We have transferred to that part a sufficient quantity of military forces, we are stronger than our enemy, and we hope to show this very soon indeed; but we need those same Soviet workers whom we had, and have, on the northern and eastern fronts, where, by their work, they secured the victories we have gained. So far there are in the south but few of you. Petrograd Comrades! There is not yet in the political or military organization of the administration of the front that revolutionary temper, that hardness and determination, which can only be given to the Red Front by the Petrograd and Moscow proletariat, that, with or without rifles, says, "I am a representative of the Petrograd Soviet, I am a Communard, and I know my post, which I will not desert, nor will I allow others to desert the posts assigned by the republic."

I have been again sent to you, to report that the center of attention of the Soviet republic is now the south, which is farther away than the north, but cannot be farther from your

political consciousness and your revolutionary preparations, because it is there that the fate of Soviet Russia and the world revolution is now to be decided. I reported here yesterday to the leading Comrades of Red Petrograd, and they, of course, quite rightly drew my attention to the fact that Petrograd has given many men to all fronts; and everywhere I am always being accosted in the train by some Petrograd or Moscow workman who is now president of the Executive Committee or of the Extraordinary Commission, or is District Commissioner—a youth of 19 or 20. I know that you have given many men, and those not the worst, to all the fronts in the provinces, but still I feel myself too much a man of Petrograd and a member of your Soviet not to know your strength and what you can do. I know that Petrograd is a Red hydra; cut off 100 heads and in their place thousands of new ones will grow. I come again to you and say: Comrades, before the spring thaw which makes the advance difficult, we must achieve decisive operations. We must enter Rostov and Novocherkask, clear the Don and plant a firm foundation for the predominance of Soviet power in all the Northern Caucasus. From the military point of view, Comrades, we have done all that we could. We now need a firm revolutionary support. Give us your Petrograd proletariat, gladiators, ready to go into fire and water, and carry whole masses with them; insure our young forces against signs of cowardice and hesitation; give us, in a word, true representatives of the Petrograd Soviet, give us all you can of such workers, and you will see that over Rostov and Novocherkask will float the Red standard of the Soviet republic.

FAMOUS TWENTY-ONE POINTS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

ADOPTED JULY, 1920

THE second congress of the Communist International adopts the following conditions for membership in the Communist International:

1. The entire propaganda and agitation must bear a genuinely Communistic character and agree with the program and the decision of the Third International. All the press organs of the party must be managed by responsible Communists, who have proved their devotion to the cause of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be talked about as if it were an ordinary formula learned by heart, but it must be propagated for in such a way as to make its necessity apparent to every plain worker, soldier and peasant through the facts of daily life, which must be systematically watched by our press and fully utilized from day to day.

PARTY MUST CONTROL PRESS

The periodical and non-periodical press and all party publishing concerns must be under the complete control of the party management, regardless of the fact that the party as a whole being at that moment legal or illegal. It is inadmissible for the publishing concerns to abuse their autonomy and to follow a policy which does not entirely correspond to the party's policy.

In the columns of the press, at public meetings, in trade unions, in co-operatives, and all other places where the sup-

porters of the Third International are admitted, it is necessary systematically and unmercifully to brand, not only the bourgeoisie, but also its accomplices, the reformers of all types.

2. Every organization that wishes to affiliate with the Communist International must regularly and systematically remove the reformist and centrist elements from all the more or less important posts in the labor movement (in party organizations, editorial offices, trade unions, parliamentary groups, co-operatives, and municipal administrations) and replace them with well-tried Communists, without taking offense at the fact that, especially in the beginning, the places of "experienced" opportunists will be filled by plain workers from the masses.

SPURN BOURGEOISIE LEGALITY

3. In nearly every country of Europe and America the class struggle is entering upon the phase of civil war. Under such circumstances the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeoisie legality.

It is their duty to create everywhere a parallel illegal organization machine which at the decisive moment will be helpful to the party in fulfilling its duty to the revolution.

In all countries where the Communists, because of a state of siege and because of exceptional laws directed against them, are unable to carry on their whole work legally, it is absolutely necessary to combine legal with illegal activities.

4. The duty of spreading Communist ideas includes the special obligation to carry on a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the army. Where this agitation is forbidden by laws of exception it is to be carried on illegally. Renunciation of such activities would be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the Third International.

SYSTEMATIC AGITATION URGED

5. It is necessary to carry on a systematic and well-planned agitation in the country districts. The working class cannot

triumph unless its policy will have insured it the support of the country proletariat and at least a part of the poorer farmers, and the neutrality of part of the rest of the village population. The Communistic work in the country is gaining greatly in importance at the present time.

It must principally be carried on with the help of the revolutionary Communist workers in the city and the country who have connections in the country. Renunciation of this work or its transfer to unreliable, semi-reformist hands is equal to renunciation of the proletarian revolution.

6. Every party that wishes to belong to the Third International is obligated to unmask not only open social patriotism, but also the dishonesty and hypocrisy of social pacifism, and systematically bring to the attention of the workers the fact that, without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no kind of an international court of arbitration, no kind of an agreement regarding the limitation of armaments, no kind of a "democratic" renovation of the League of Nations will be able to prevent fresh imperialistic wars.

MUST BREAK WITH REFORMISM

7. The parties wishing to belong to the Communist International are obligated to proclaim a clean break with the reformism and with the policy of the "center" and to propagate this break throughout the ranks of the entire party membership. Without this a logical Communist policy is impossible.

The Communist International demands unconditionally and in the form of an ultimatum the execution of this break within a very brief period. The Communist International cannot reconcile itself to a condition that would allow notorious opportunists, such as are now represented by Turati, Kautsky, Hilferding, Hillquit, Longuet, MacDonald, Modigliani, et al., to have the right to be counted as members of the Third International. That could only lead to the Third International resembling to a high degree the dead Second International.

8. In the matter of colonies and oppressed nations a particu-

larly clear-cut stand by the parties is necessary in those countries whose bourgeoisie is in possession of colonies and oppresses other nations.

Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International is obligated to unmask the tricks of "its" own imperialists in the colonies, to support every movement for freedom in the colonies, not only with words but with deeds, to demand the expulsion of its native imperialists from those colonies, to create in the hearts of the workers of its own country a genuine fraternal feeling for the working population of the colonies and for the oppressed nations and to carry on a systematic agitation among the troops of its own country against all oppression of the colonial peoples.

9. Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International must systematically and persistently develop a Communistic agitation within the trade unions, the workers' and shop councils, the co-operatives of consumption and other mass organizations of the workers.

Within these organizations it is necessary to organize Communistic nuclei which, through continuous and persistent work, are to win over the trade unions, etc., for the cause of Communism. These nuclei are obligated in their daily work everywhere to expose the treason of social patriots and the instability of the "center." The Communist nuclei must be completely under the control of the party as a whole.

10. Every party belonging to the Communist International is obligated to carry on a stubborn struggle against the Amsterdam "International" of the yellow trade unions. It must carry on a most emphatic propaganda among the workers organized in trade unions for a break with the yellow Amsterdam International. With all its means it must support the rising international association of the Red trade unions which affiliate with the Communist International.

MUST WATCH PARLIAMENTARIANS

11. Parties wishing to belong to the Third International are obligated to subject the personnel of the parliamentary groups

to a revision, to cleanse these groups of all unreliable elements, and to make these groups subject to the party executives, not only in form but in fact, by demanding that each Communist member of Parliament subordinate his entire activities to the interests of genuinely revolutionary propaganda and agitation.

12. The parties belonging to the Communist International must be built upon the principle of democratic centralization. In the present epoch of acute civil war the Communist party will only be in a position to do its duty if it is organized along extremely centralized lines, if it is controlled by iron discipline, and if its party central body, supported by the confidence of the party membership, is fully equipped with power, authority and the most far-reaching faculties.

13. The Communist parties of those countries where the Communists carry on their work legally must from time to time institute cleansings (new registrations) of the personnel of their party organization in order to systematically rid the party of the petit bourgeois elements creeping into it.

MUST SUPPORT SOVIETS

14. Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International is obligated to offer unqualified support to every Soviet republic in its struggle against the counter-revolutionary forces. The Communist parties must carry on a clean-cut propaganda for the hindering of the transportation of munitions of war to the enemies of the Soviet Republic; and furthermore, they must use all means, legal or illegal, to carry propaganda, etc., among the troops sent to throttle the workers' republic.

15. Parties that have thus far still retained their old Social Democratic programs are now obligated to alter these programs within the shortest time possible and, in accordance with the particular conditions of their countries, work out a new Communist program in the sense of the decisions of the Communist International.

As a rule the program of every party belonging to the Communist International must be sanctioned by the regular Congress of the Communist International, or by its executive committee.

In case the program of any party is not sanctioned by the executive committee of the Communist International, the party concerned has the right to appeal to the Congress of the Communist International.

CONGRESS RULES ARE BINDING

16. All decisions of the Congress as of the Communist International, as well as the decisions of its executive committee, are binding upon all the parties belonging to the Communist International. The Communist International, which is working under conditions of the most acute civil war, must be constructed along much more centralized lines than was the case with the Second International.

In this connection, of course, the Communist International and its executive committee must, in their entire activities, take into consideration the varied conditions under which the individual parties have to fight and labor, and only adopt decisions of general application regarding such questions as can be covered by such decisions.

17. In connection with this, all parties wishing to belong to the Communist International must change their names. Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International must bear the name: Communist party of such and such a country (section of the Third Communist International). The question of name is not only a formal matter, but is also to a high degree a political question of great importance.

The Communist International has declared war upon the whole bourgeois world and all yellow Social Democratic parties. It is necessary to make clear to every plain workingman the difference between the Communist parties and the old official "Social Democratic" and "Socialist" parties that have betrayed the banner of the working class.

MUST PRINT ALL DOCUMENTS

18. All the leading press organs of the parties of all countries are obligated to print all important official documents of the executive committee of the Communist International.

19. All parties that belong to the Communist International, or that have applied for admission to it, are obligated to call, as soon as possible, but at the latest not more than four months after the second congress of the Communist International, a special convention for the purpose of examining all these conditions.

In this connection the central bodies must see to it that all the local organizations are made acquainted with the decisions of the second congress of the Communist International.

20. Those parties that thus far wish to enter into the Third International, but have not radically changed their former tactics, must see to it that two-thirds of the members of their central committees and of all their important central bodies are Comrades who unambiguously and publicly declared in favor of their parties' entry into the Third International before the second congress of the Communist International.

Exceptions may be allowed with the approval of the executive committee of the Third International. The executive committee of the Communist International also has the right to make exceptions in the cases of the representatives of the center tendency named in paragraph 7.

21. Those party members who, on principle, reject the conditions and these laid down by the Communist International are to be expelled from the party.

The same thing applies especially to delegates to the special party convention.

MOSCOW INTERNATIONAL ISSUES MANIFESTO

(From N. Y. *Call*, January 27, 1919)

FAILING to measure up to the standard of Socialist ethics set by the Moscow International, Morris Hillquit, Jean Longuet, and Karl Kautsky are classed as social-reformers by the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in a manifesto dated September 1, 1919.

In the United States, the Industrial Workers of the World, according to this manifesto, is leading the fight for the Soviets.

“The universal unifying program is at the present moment the recognition of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the Soviet power,” it declares, and then proceeds to draw a line of distinction between the revolutionary proletariat and the opportunists, between “the Communists and the social-traitors of every brand.”

The manifesto follows:

DEAR COMRADES:

The present phase of the revolutionary movement has, along with other questions, very sharply placed the question of parliamentarism upon the order of the day’s discussion. In France, America, England and Germany, simultaneously with the

aggravation of the class struggle, all revolutionary elements are adhering to the Communist movement by uniting among themselves or by co-ordinating their actions under the slogan of Soviet power. The anarchistic-syndicalist groups and the groups that now and then call themselves simply anarchistic are thus also joining the general current. The executive committee of the Communist International welcomes this most heartily.

I. W. W. LEADS FIGHT FOR SOVIET HERE

In France the syndicalist group of Comrade Pericot forms the heart of the Communist party; in America, and also to some extent in England, the fight for the Soviets is led by such organizations as the I. W. W. (Industrial Workers of the World). These groups and tendencies have always actively opposed the parliamentary methods of fighting.

On the other hand, the elements of the Communist party that are derived from the Socialist parties are, for the most part, inclined to recognize action in Parliament, too. (The Loriot group in France, the members of the A.S.P. in America [possibly meaning the American Socialist party], of the Independent Labor party in England, etc.). All these tendencies, which ought to be united as soon as possible in the Communist party at all cost, need uniform tactics. Consequently, the question must be decided on a broad scale and as a general measure, and the executive committee of the Communist International turns to all the affiliated parties with the present circular letter, which is especially dedicated to this question.

RECOGNITION OF DICTATORSHIP UNIFYING PROGRAM

The universal unifying program is at the present moment the recognition of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the Soviet power. History has so placed the question that it is right on this question that the line is drawn between the revolutionary proletariat and the opportunists, between the Communists and the

social traitors of every brand. The so-called Centre (Kautsky in Germany, Longuet in France, the I. L. P. and some elements of the B. S. P. in England, Hillquit in America) is, in spite of its protestations, an objectively anti-Socialist tendency, because it cannot, and does not wish to, lead the struggle for the Soviet power of the proletariat.

On the contrary, those groups and parties which formerly rejected any kind of political struggles (for example, some anarchist groups), have, by recognizing the Soviet power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, really abandoned their old standpoint as to political action, because they have recognized the idea of the seizure of power by the working class, the power that is necessary for the suppression of the opposing bourgeoisie. Thus, we repeat, a common program for the struggle for the Soviet dictatorship has been found.

The old divisions in the international labor movement have plainly outlived their time. The war has caused a regrouping. Many of the anarchists or syndicalists, who rejected parliamentarism, conducted themselves just as despicably and treasonably during the five years of the war as did the old leaders of the Social Democracy who always have the name of Marx on their lips. The unification of forces is being effected in a new manner: some are for the proletarian revolution, for the Soviets, for the dictatorship, for mass action, even up to armed uprisings —the others are against this plan. This is the principal question of to-day. This is the main criterion. The new combinations will be formed according to these labels, and are being so formed already.

SOVIETISM AND PARLIAMENTARISM

In what relation does the recognition of the Soviet idea stand to parliamentarism? Right here a sharp dividing line must be drawn between two questions which logically have nothing to do with each other: The question of parliamentarism as a desired form of the organization of the state and the question of the exploitation of parliamentarism for the development of the revolution. The Comrades often confuse these two ques-

tions, something which has an extraordinarily injurious effect upon the entire practical struggle. We wish to discuss each of these questions in its order and draw all the necessary deductions.

SOVIET POWER INCOMPATIBLE WITH PARLIAMENTARISM

What is the form of the proletarian dictatorship? We reply: The Soviets. This has been demonstrated by an experience that has a world-wide significance. Can the Soviet power be combined with parliamentarism? No, and yet again, no. It is absolutely incompatible with the existing parliaments, because the parliamentary machine embodies the concentrated power of the bourgeoisie. The deputies, the chambers of deputies, their newspapers, the system of bribery, the secret connections of the parliamentarians with the leaders of the banks, the connection with all the apparatus of the bourgeois state—all these are fetters for the working class. They must be burst.

The governmental machine of the bourgeoisie, consequently also the bourgeois parliaments, are to be broken, disrupted, destroyed, and upon their ruins is to be organized a new power, the power of the union of the working class, the workers' "parliaments," *i.e.*, the Soviets.

PEACEFUL REVOLUTION NOT OBTAINABLE BY PARLIAMENTARY METHODS

Only the betrayers of the workers can deceive the workers with the hope of a "peaceful" social revolution, along the lines of parliamentary reforms. Such persons are the worst enemies of the working class, and a most pitiless struggle must be waged against them; no compromise with them is permissible. Therefore, our slogan for any bourgeois country you may choose is: "Down with the Parliament! Long live the power of the Soviets!"

Nevertheless, a person may put the question this way: "Very well, you deny the power of the present bourgeois parliaments; then why don't you organize new, more democratic parliaments on the basis of a real universal suffrage?" During the Socialist

revolution the struggle has become so acute that the working class must act quickly and resolutely, without allowing its class enemies to enter into its camp, into its organization of power. Such qualities are only found in the Soviets of workers, soldiers, sailors and peasants, elected in the factories and shops, in the country and in the barracks. So the question of the form of the proletarian power is put this way. Now the government is to be overthrown. Kings, presidents, parliaments, chambers of deputies, national assemblies—all these institutions are our sworn enemies, that must be destroyed.

DESTROY PARLIAMENTS WHILE UTILIZING THEM, SAY COMMUNISTS

Now we take up the second basic question: Can the bourgeois parliaments be fully utilized for the purpose of developing the revolutionary class struggle? Logically, as we just remarked, this question is by no means related to the first question. In fact: A person surely can be trying to destroy any kind of an organization by joining it and by "utilizing" it. This is also perfectly understood by our class enemies when they exploit the official Social Democratic parties, the trade unions and the like for their purposes.

BROKE UP CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

Let us take the extreme example: The Russian Communists, the Bolsheviks, voted in the election for the Constituent Assembly. They met in its hall. But they came there to break up this Constituent within 24 hours and fully to realize the Soviet power. The party of the Bolsheviks also had its deputies in the Czar's Imperial Duma. Did the party at that time "recognize" the Duma, as an ideal, or, at least, an endurable form of government? It would be lunacy to assume that. It sent its representatives there so as to proceed against the apparatus of the Czarist power from that side, too, and to contribute to the destruction of that same Duma. It was not for nothing that the Czarist government condemned the Bolshevik "parliamentari-

ans" to prison for "high treason." The Bolshevik leaders were also carrying on an illegal work, although they temporarily made use of their "inviolability" in welding together the masses for the drive against Czarism.

But Russia was not the only place where that kind of "parliamentary" activity was carried on. Look at Germany and the activities of Liebknecht. The murdered Comrade was the perfect type of a revolutionist, and so was there then something non-revolutionary in the fact that he, from the tribune of the cursed Prussian Landtag, called upon the soldiers to rise against the Landtag? On the contrary. Here, too, we see the complete admissibility and usefulness of his exploitation of the situation. If Liebknecht had not been a deputy he would never have been able to accomplish such an act; his speeches would have had no such an echo. The example of the Swedish Communists in Parliament also convinces us of this. In Sweden Comrade Hoglund played, and plays, the same role as Liebknecht did in Germany. Making use of his position as a deputy, he assists in destroying the bourgeois parliamentary system; none else in Sweden has done as much for the cause of the revolution and the struggle against the war as our friend.

BULGARIAN COMMUNISTS' WORK SATISFACTORY

In Bulgaria we see the same thing. The Bulgarian Communists have successfully exploited the tribune of Parliament for revolutionary purposes. At the recent elections they won seats for 47 deputies. Comrades Blagoief, Kirkof, Kolarof, and other leaders of the Bulgarian Communist party understand how to exploit the parliamentary tribune in the service of the proletarian revolution. Such "parliamentary work" demands peculiar daring and a special revolutionary spirit; the men there are occupying especially dangerous positions; they are laying mines under the enemy while in the enemy's camp; they enter Parliament for the purpose of getting this machine in their hands in order to assist the masses behind the walls of the Parliament in the work of blowing it up.

Are we for the maintenance of the bourgeois "democratic" parliaments as the form of the administration of the state?

No, not in any case. We are for the Soviets.

But are we for the full utilization of these parliaments for our Communist work—as long as we are not yet strong enough to overthrow the Parliament?

PARLIAMENTARY BETRAYAL HERE IS CHARGE

Yes, we are for this—in consideration of a whole list of conditions. We know very well that in France, America and England no such parliamentarians have yet arisen from the masses of the workers. In those countries we have up to now observed a picture of parliamentary betrayal. But this is no proof of the incorrectness of the tactics that we regard as correct!

It is only a matter of there being revolutionary parties there like the Bolsheviks or the German Spartacists. If there is such a party then everything can become quite different. It is particularly necessary: 1, that the deciding center of the struggle lies outside Parliament (strikes, uprisings and other kinds of mass action); 2, that the activities in Parliament be combined with this struggle; 3, that the deputies also perform illegal work; 4, that they act for the central committee and subject to its orders; 5, that they do not heed the parliamentary forms in their acts (have no fear of direct clashes with the bourgeois majority, "talk past it," etc.).

NO FIXED ELECTION TACTICS

The matter of taking part in the election at a given time, during a given electoral campaign, depends upon a whole string of concrete circumstances which, in each country, must be particularly considered at each given time. The Russian Bolsheviks were for boycotting the elections for the first Imperial Duma in 1906. And these same persons were for taking part in the elections of the second Imperial Duma, when it had been shown that the bourgeois-agrarian power would still rule in Russia for many a

year. In the year 1918, before the election for the German National Assembly, one section of the Spartacists was for taking part in the elections, the other section was against it. But the party of the Spartacists remained a unified Communist party.

RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS LEAVE ROOM FOR MANEUVERING

In principle we cannot renounce utilization of parliamentarism. The party of the Russian Bolshevik declared, in the spring of 1918, at its seventh congress, when it was already in power, in a special resolution, that the Russian Communists, in case the bourgeois democracy in Russia, through a peculiar combination of circumstances, should once more get the upper hand, could be compelled to return to the utilization of bourgeois parliamentarism. Room for maneuvering is also to be allowed in this respect.

The Comrades' principal efforts are to consist in the work of mobilizing the masses; establishing the party, organizing their own groups in the unions and capturing them, organizing Soviets in the course of the struggle, leading the mass struggle, agitation for the revolution among the masses—all this is of first-line importance; parliamentary action and participation in electoral campaigns only as one of the helps in this work—no more.

INSISTS UPON UNITY OF COMMUNISTS

If this is so—and it undoubtedly is so—then it is a matter of course that it doesn't pay to split into those factions that are of different opinions only about this, now secondary, question. The practice of parliamentary prostitution was so disgusting that even the best Comrades have prejudices in this question. These ought to be overcome in the course of the revolutionary struggle. Therefore, we urgently appeal to all groups and organizations which are carrying on a real struggle for the Soviets, and call upon them to unite firmly, even despite the lack of agreement on this question.

All those who are for the Soviets and the proletarian dictator-

ship wish to unite as soon as possible and form a unified Communist party.

With Communist greetings,

G. ZINOVIEF,

President of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

September 1, 1919.

MANIFESTO OF THE MOSCOW INTERNATIONAL

(From *N. Y. Call*, July 24, 1919)

THE following is a full copy of the manifesto adopted by the Moscow, or Communist, International Congress, held March 2d, last. Much interest and no little mystery have shrouded the history of the congress. Called to organize a Third International, the blockade and denial of passports made it impossible for the Russian Communist party (the Bolsheviks), under whose auspices it was held, to hold the congress altogether in the open.

The Russian Socialists have adopted the old name of the time of Marx and Engels, that of Communists, to distinguish themselves from those Socialists of Europe who supported the imperialism of their governments during the war. The use of the name is somewhat confusing, inasmuch as the word has another and a distinct meaning in English; but, wherever it is used, it means revolutionary Socialists as distinguished from Social patriots and mere parliamentary Socialists.

It is known that the invitation to send delegates did not specifically include the Socialist party of the United States by name, but called for delegates from the Socialist Labor party, the Socialist

Propaganda League, the I. W. W., the W. I. I. U. and "those sections of the Socialist party whose sentiments are expressed by Debs."

It is known that the information on Socialist conditions in the United States was supplied to the Bolsheviks of Russia by Boris Reinstein, a member of the Socialist Labor party, and one S. J. Rutgers, a Dutch Communist, who resided in America for a few years, and who organized the now long defunct Socialist Propaganda League. He is now in Moscow.

It is believed that Rutgers and Reinstein were seated as representatives of the United States, with voice and no vote.

The authors of the manifesto are Charles Rakovsky, Nicholai Lenin, G. Zinovieff, Leon Trotzky and Fritz Platten. The congress was, necessarily, composed largely of Russian Bolsheviks and syndicalists, but it is said that there were some Swiss, Italians and French Socialists there who happened to be in Russia at the time.

The manifesto, here given in full, hitherto has not been printed in its entirety in America.

THE GUIDING LINES OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

[ADOPTED AT THE CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
FROM MARCH 2 TO 6, 1919.]

I

A new era has dawned, the era of the collapse of capitalism, of its internal breakup, the era of the Communist revolution of

the proletariat. Triumphant proletarian revolutions in some countries; growing revolutionary fermentation in other countries; uprisings in colonies; the utter incapacity of the governing classes to guide any further the destinies of peoples—that is the spectacle of the present state of things throughout the world.

Humanity, whose entire civilization now lies shattered in fragments, is menaced by the danger of complete annihilation. There is only one power which can save it; that power is the proletariat. The old capitalist “order” cannot exist any longer. Chaos is the final result of the capitalist method of production, and it can only be overcome by the largest productive class—the working class. Real order—the Communist order—must be made by the workers. They must break the domination of capitalism, make wars impossible, abolish all state frontiers, transform the whole world into one community whose labor shall be for its own good, and realize the brotherhood and liberty of the peoples.

As against this, world capitalism is making ready for the final contest. Under the guise of “a League of Nations,” and with a host of pacifist phrases, it is making a last attempt to piece together again the parts of the capitalist system, which are spontaneously crumbling, and to direct its forces against the ever-growing proletarian revolution. The proletariat must reply to this colossal conspiracy of the capitalist class by the conquest of the political power, direct that power against its class enemies, and set it in motion as a lever for the economic revolution. The ultimate triumph of the proletariat of the world means the beginning of the true history of a free humanity.

THE CONQUEST OF POLITICAL POWER

The capture of political power by the proletariat is identical with the destruction of the political power of the bourgeoisie. The organized power of the bourgeoisie is the bourgeois machinery of the government, with its capitalist army, commanded by bourgeois and junker officers; with its police and gendarmerie; with its jailers and judges; with its priests and state function-

aries. The conquest of political power does not simply mean a change of personnel in the ministries. It means the overthrow of the hostile state-machinery, the disarmament of the bourgeoisie, of the counter-revolutionary officers, the White Guards and the arming of the proletariat, of the revolutionary soldiers and of the Red Workers' Guards; the removal of all bourgeois judges, and the organization of proletarian tribunals; the abolition of the rule of the reactionary state officials and the creation of new proletarian organs of administration. The triumph of the proletariat consists in disorganizing the hostile authority and organizing the proletarian authority; in destroying the bourgeois state machine and creating a proletarian machinery of state. Only after the proletariat has achieved victory and has broken the resistance of the bourgeoisie can it make use of its former opponents for the benefit of the new order by placing them under its control and gradually associating them in the work of Communist reconstruction.

DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

The proletarian state, like every other state, is an apparatus of repression. It is, however, directed against the enemies of the working class. Its aim is to break down the resistance of the exploiters, who, in the desperate contest, use every means to suppress the revolution in blood and render it impossible. The dictatorship of the proletariat, which gives it a privileged position in society, is, otherwise, a temporary arrangement. In proportion as the resistance of the bourgeoisie is broken and the bourgeoisie is expropriated and gradually becomes a part of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat will disappear, the state will die out and classes will cease to exist.

So-called democracy, *i.e.*, the bourgeois democracy, is nothing but the veiled dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The famous common "will of the people" no more exists than does the "homogeneous nation." As a matter of fact, what exists is classes with antagonistic, irreconcilable interests. Inasmuch, however, as the bourgeoisie represents but a small minority, it needs this

fiction, this pretense of the national "will of the people," in order, by means of this high-sounding phrase, to establish its domination over the working classes and to impose upon them its own class-will. As against this, the proletariat forming, as it does, the vast majority of the population, openly makes use of the class-power of its mass-organizations, of its councils (Soviets), in order to abolish the privileges of the bourgeoisie, and to secure the passage to a Communist society, in which class will have no place. In bourgeois democracy the center of gravity lies in the purely formal declarations of rights and liberties; which, however, are quite unattainable by the working people—the proletariat and semi-proletariat—who possess no material means, while the bourgeoisie employs its material means in order to deceive and gull the people with the aid of its press and organizations. As against this, the Soviet system—this new type of state-authority—applies itself to the task of enabling the proletariat to realize its rights and liberties. The Soviet authority hands over the best palaces, houses, printing works, stocks of paper, etc., to the people for its press, its meetings and its unions. Only in this way, indeed, does a real proletarian democracy become possible.

Bourgeois democracy, with its parliamentary system, only deludes the masses of the people into believing that they participate in the government of the State. In point of fact the masses and their organizations are held completely at a distance from actual power and actual government. In the Soviet system, on the contrary, it is the organizations of the masses, and through them the masses themselves that govern, since the Soviets associate with the State administration an ever-increasing number of workers. Only in this way will the entire working population gradually become associated with the actual business of government. The Soviet system rests therefore on the mass-organizations of the proletariat, that is, on the councils (Soviets) themselves, the revolutionary trades unions, co-operative societies, etc. Bourgeois democracy and the parliamentary system, by the separation of legislative and executive power and by the irrevocable parliamentary mandate, widen the gulf between the

masses and the State. Under the Soviet system, on the contrary, the right of recall, the combination of the legislative and executive powers, the character of the councils as working corporations, identify the masses with the governments of the country. This connection is further promoted by the fact that under the Soviet system the elections do not take place on the basis of artificial territorial areas but on that of places of production.

In this way the Soviet system realizes true proletarian democracy—democracy for and within the proletariat, as against the bourgeoisie. The industrial proletariat enjoys under this system a privileged position, since it is the most advanced, the best organized, and, politically, the ripest class under whose hegemony the semi-proletariat and the small peasant of the countryside are to be gradually raised to a higher level. These temporary privileges of the industrial proletariat must be made use of in order to withdraw the poorer lower middle class masses of the countryside from under the influence of the large farmers and bourgeoisie, and to organize and educate them as co-workers in the task of communist reconstruction.

II

THE EXPROPRIATION OF THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF PRODUCTION

The dissolution of the capitalist order and of capitalist discipline of labor makes the re-establishment of production on a capitalist basis impossible. Wage disputes of the workers, even if they are successful, do not bring about the expected amelioration in their condition. The standard of the worker's life can really be raised only when production is controlled not by the bourgeoisie but by the proletariat itself. In order to raise the productive economic powers, in order to break at the earliest possible moment the resistance of the bourgeoisie, which is prolonging the death struggle of the old social order, and is thus leading to utter ruin, the proletarian dictatorship must carry through the expropriation of the large capitalists and landowners

and transform the means of production and exchange into the common property of the proletarian State.

Communism is now being born from the wreckage of capitalism. History does not offer mankind any other way of escape. The opportunists who make the Utopian demand for the resuscitation of the capitalist economic society, in order to defer socialization, only prolong the process of dissolution and increase the menace of a total cataclysm. The Communist revolution, on the contrary, is the best and only means by which the most important productive force—the proletariat, and with it society itself—can be preserved.

Proletarian dictatorship in no way carries with it any kind of distribution of the means of production and exchange. On the contrary, its object is to bring about a greater centralization of the productive forces and to co-ordinate production as a whole, according to one uniform plan. As the first steps to the socialization of the entire economic resources the following may be mentioned: The socialization of the machinery of the great banking institutions which at present control production; the capture through the government of the proletariat of all the economic institutions managed by the state; the taking over of all municipal enterprises; the socialization of the syndicates and trusts, as well as such industries where the concentration and centralization of capital permits it; the socialization of landed estates and their conversion into socially managed agricultural concerns. As regards the smaller concerns the proletariat must unite them by degrees, according to their size. But here it must be expressly emphasized that small property will in no way be expropriated, and that proprietors who do not exploit hired labor will not be exposed to any violent measures. This section of the population will be gradually drawn into the Socialist organization by example and by practice, which will demonstrate to it the advantages of the new order—the order which will release the small peasantry and the small urban producer from the economic pressure of usurious capitalists and landlords and from the burden of taxation (especially through the annulment of State debts).

The task of the proletarian dictatorship in the economical

sphere can only be fulfilled in proportion as the proletariat is able to create centralized organs for the management of production and to introduce management by the workers. To that end it must necessarily make use of those of its mass organizations which are most closely bound up with the process of production.

DISTRIBUTION

In the domain of distribution the proletarian dictatorship must replace commerce by a just distribution of products. To attain that the following measures need to be taken: The socialization of the whole business; the taking over by the proletariat of the entire state and municipal machinery of distribution; the control of the large co-operative societies, whose organizations will yet play an important economic part in the period of transition, and the gradual centralization and conversion of all these bodies into one homogeneous whole, carrying out a rational distribution of products.

Both in the sphere of production and in that of distribution all qualified technicians and specialists are to be made use of when their political opposition has been broken and they have learned how to accommodate themselves, not to capitalism, but to the new system of production. The proletariat will not oppress them, but, on the contrary, will give them for the first time the opportunity for unfolding their creative capacities. The proletarian dictatorship will replace the separation between manual and brain work which capitalism has developed by their combination, and in that way will unite science and labor. Simultaneously with the expropriation of factories, mines, estates, etc., the proletariat must abolish the exploitation of the people by capitalist house owners, and place the large houses at the disposal of the local workers' councils, and settle the working class in bourgeois residences.

During this great period of transformation the Soviets must build up, without intermission, the whole apparatus of government in an ever more centralized form, while at the same time

directly associating with administration ever larger sections of the laboring population.

THE ROAD TO VICTORY

The revolutionary epoch demands that the proletariat should employ such fighting methods as will concentrate its entire energy, *viz.*, the method of mass action, and lead to its logical consequence—the direct collision with the capitalist state machine in an open combat. All other methods, *e.g.*, revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentarism, will in the revolution have only a subordinate value.

The indispensable prerequisite of such a successful struggle is the separation, not only from the actual lackeys of capitalism and the executioners of the Communist revolution—which is the role of the Social-Democrats of the Right—but also from the Center parties (like the Kautskyans), which at the critical moment invariably abandon the proletariat in order to compromise with its avowed enemies. On the other hand, a coalition is necessary with those elements of the revolutionary workers' movement who, though they did not previously belong to the Socialist party, now, on the whole, take up the standpoint of the proletarian dictatorship in the form of the power of Soviets, *e.g.*, some of the sections among the Syndicalists.

The growth of the revolutionary movement in all countries; the danger of the strangulation of this revolution by the alliance of capitalist states; the attempt of the Socialist traitors to bind themselves together (the formation of the Yellow "International" at Berne) in order to help the Wilsonian League; and lastly, the absolute necessity of co-ordinating proletarian activities—all this must lead to the establishment of a really revolutionary and really proletarian-communist international. This international, subordinating as it does so-called national interests to the interests of the international revolution, will embody the mutual aid of the proletarian in the various countries, because without economic and other mutual assistance the proletariat will not be able to organize the new society. On the other hand, inter-

national proletarian Communism, in contrast to the yellow Socialist-patriotic international, will give support to the exploited colonial races in their fight against imperialism, so as to advance the ultimate overthrow of the imperialist world system.

THE FINAL CONFLICT

The capitalist criminals asserted at the outbreak of the World War that they were only defending their respective Fatherlands. Soon, however, German imperialism showed by its acts of blood in Russia, in the Ukraine and in Finland, its real predatory character. At present the Entente Powers, too, stand unmasked as world-bandits and murderers of the proletariat. In company with the German bourgeoisie and with the Socialist-patriots, their lips muttering hypocritical phrases about peace, they are trying, by the aid of their war machines and stupefied barbarian colonial troops, to throttle the revolution of the European proletariat. The White Terror of the bourgeoisie is indescribable, countless are its victims amongst the working classes. Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg—their best—have perished. Against this the proletariat must defend itself—defend itself at all cost! The Communist international calls the whole world-proletariat to this, the final struggle!

Down with the imperialist conspiracy of capital! Long live the international republic of proletarian Soviet!

THE NEW COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

(From N. Y. *Call*, September 1, 1919)

THE following is the preamble to the *Manifesto* of the Moscow International congress of last March, now made available in complete form in this country for the first time. As was stated at the time of the printing of the main part of the *Manifesto*, the congress was called by the Communist party of Russia (the Bolsheviks) and the invitations to various party groups was tendered by Lenine on the basis of information given him by such men as Boris Reinstein, S. J. Rutgers and others. The word "communist," as we explained at that time, is exactly identical to the word "Socialist" as used in America, the Bolsheviks going back to the old word used by Marx and Engels in 1848, because of the disrepute that the "ministerial" Socialists had cast upon the word Socialist, and also to distinguish the real Socialists (like those of Russia, Italy, Switzerland and the United States) from the compromisers and supporters of imperialism in Germany and Sweden and other countries. The *Manifesto* was written by Nicholai Lenine, Leon Trotzky, Zinoviev, Tchicherin and Fritz Platten, a Swiss Socialist.

PREAMBLE

Seventy-two years have gone by since the Communist party of the world proclaimed its program in the form of the *Manifesto* written by the greatest teachers of the proletarian revolution, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

Even at that early time, when Communism had scarcely come into the arena of conflict, it was hounded by the lies, hatred and calumny of the possessing classes, who rightly suspected in it their mortal enemy.

During these seven decades Communism has traveled a hard road; storms of ascent followed by periods of sharp decline; successes, but also severe defeats. In spite of all, the development at bottom went the way forecast by the *Manifesto* of the Communist party. The epoch of the last decisive battle came later than the apostles of the social revolution expected and wished. But it has come.

We Communists, representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of the different countries of Europe, America and Asia, assembled in Soviet Moscow, feel and consider ourselves followers and fulfillers of the program proclaimed seventy-two years ago. It is our task now to sum up the practical revolutionary experience of the working class, to cleanse the movement of its admixtures of opportunism and social patriotism, and to gather together the forces of all the true revolutionary proletarian parties in

order to further and hasten the complete victory of the Communist revolution.

I

THE INEVITABLE WAR

For a long span of years Socialism predicted the inevitableness of the imperialistic war; it perceived the essential cause of this war in the insatiable greed of the possessing classes in both camps of capitalist nations.

Two years before the outbreak of the war, at the Congress of Basle, the responsible Socialist leaders of all countries branded imperialism as the instigator of the coming war, and menaced the bourgeoisie with the threat of the Socialist revolution—the retaliation of the proletariat for the crimes of militarism. Now, after the experience of five years, after history has disclosed the predatory lust of Germany and has unmasked the no less criminal deeds on the part of the Allies, the state Socialists of the Entente nations, together with their governments, again and again unmask the deposed German Kaiser. And the German social patriots, who in August, 1914, proclaimed the diplomatic *White Book* of the Hohenzollern as the holiest gospel of the people, to-day, in vulgar sycophancy, join themselves with the Socialists of the Entente lands to accuse as archcriminal the deposed German monarchy which they formerly served as slaves. In this way they hope to erase the memory of their own guilt and thus gain the good will of the victors. But alongside the dethroned dynasties of the Romanoffs, Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs and capitalistic cliques of these lands, the rulers of France, England, Italy and the United States stand revealed in the light of unfolding events and diplomatic disclosures in their immeasurable vileness.

The contradictions of the capitalist system were converted by the war into beastly torments of hunger and cold, epidemics and moral savagery for all mankind. Hereby also the academic

quarrel in Socialism over the theory of increasing misery, and also of the undermining of capitalism through Socialism is now determined. Statisticians and teachers of the theory of reconciliation of these contradictions have endeavored for decades to gather together from all corners of the earth real and apparent facts which evidence the increasing well-being of the working class. To-day abysmal misery is before our eyes, social as well as physiological, in all its shocking reality.

CATASTROPHE OF FINANCE

Finance-capital, which threw mankind into the abyss of war, has itself suffered catastrophic changes during the course of the war. The dependence of paper money upon the material basis of production was completely destroyed. More and more losing its significance as medium and regulator of capitalistic commodity circulation, paper money becomes merely a means of exploitation, robbery, of military economic oppression. The complete deterioration of paper money now reflects the general deadly crisis of capitalist commodity exchange.

As free competition was replaced as regulator of production and distribution in the chief domains of economy, during the decades which preceded the war, by the system of trusts and monopolies, so the exigencies of the war took the regulating role out of the hands of the monopolies and gave it directly to the military power. Distribution of raw materials, utilization of petroleum from Baku or Rumania, of coal from Donetz, of cereals from the Ukraine; the fate of German locomotives, railroad cars and automobiles, the provisioning of famine-stricken Europe with bread and meat—all these basic questions of the economic life of the world are no longer regulated by free competition, nor yet by combinations of national and international trusts, but through direct application of military force.

Just as complete subordination of the power of the state to the purposes of finance-capital led mankind to the imperialistic shambles, so finance-capital has, through this mass slaughter, completely militarized not alone the state, but also itself. It is

no longer able to fulfill its essential economic functions otherwise than by means of blood and iron.

STATE CAPITALISM A FACT

The absorption by the state of the economic life, so vigorously opposed by capitalist liberalism, has now become a fact. There can be no return either to free competition nor to the rule of the trusts, syndicates and other economic monsters. The only question is who shall be the future mainstay of state production, the imperialistic state or the state of the victorious proletariat. In other words, shall the entire working humanity become the feudal bond servants of the victorious Entente bourgeoisie, which, under the name of a League of Nations, aided by an "international" army and an "international" navy, here plunders and murders, there throws a crumb, but everywhere enchains the proletariat, with the single aim of maintaining its own rule? Or will the working class take into its own hands the disorganized and shattered economic life and make certain its reconstruction on a Socialist basis?

PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

Only the proletarian dictatorship, which recognizes neither inherited nor rights of property but which arises from the needs of the hungering masses, can shorten the period of the present crisis; and for this purpose it mobilizes the universal duty of labor, establishes the regime of industrial discipline, this way to heal in the course of a few years the open wounds caused by the war and also to raise humanity to a new undreamed-of height.

The national state, which was given a tremendous impulse by capitalistic evolution, has become too narrow for the development of the productive forces. And even more untenable has become the position of the small states, distributed among the great powers of Europe and in other parts of the world. These small states came into existence at different times as fragments split off the bigger states, as petty currency in payment for services rendered, to serve as strategic buffer states.

They, too, have their dynasties, their ruling gangs, their imperialistic pretensions, their diplomatic machinations. Their illusory independence had until the war precisely the same support as the European balance of power, namely, the continuous opposition between the two imperialistic camps. The war has destroyed this balance.

The tremendous preponderance of power which the war gave to Germany in the beginning compelled these smaller nations to seek their welfare and safety under the wings of German militarism. After Germany was beaten the bourgeoisie of the small nations, together with their patriotic "Socialists," turned to the victorious imperialism of the Allies and began to seek assurance for their further independent existence in the hypocritical points of the Wilson program.

At the same time the number of little states has increased; out of the unity of the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy, out of the different parts of the Czarist empire, new sovereignties have formed themselves. And these, as soon as born, jump at each other's throats on account of their frontier disputes. Meanwhile, the Allied imperialists brought about certain combinations of new and old small states through the cement of mutual hatreds and general weaknesses. Even while violating the small and weak peoples and delivering them to famine and degradation, the Entente imperialists, exactly as the imperialists of the Central Powers before them, did not cease to talk of the right of self-determination of all peoples, a right which is now entirely destroyed in Europe and in the rest of the world.

PROLETARIANS ONLY CAN SAVE

Only the proletarian revolution can secure the existence of the small nations, a revolution which frees the productive forces of all countries from the restrictions of the national states, which unites all peoples in the closest economic co-operation on the basis of a universal economic plan, and gives even to the smallest and weakest peoples the possibility freely and independently to carry on their national culture without detriment

to the united and centralized economy of Europe and of the whole world.

The last war, after all a war against the colonies, was at the same time a war with the aid of the colonies. To an unprecedented extent the population of the colonies was drawn into the European war, Indians, Arabs, Madagascars battled on the European continent—what for?—for their right to remain slaves of England or France. Never did capitalist rule show itself more shameless, never was the truth of colonial slavery brought into such sharp relief. As a consequence we witnessed a series of open rebellions and revolutionary ferment in all colonies. In Europe itself it was Ireland which reminded us in bloody street battles that it is still an enslaved country and feels itself as such. In Madagascar, in Annam, and in other countries, the troops of the bourgeois republic have had more than one insurrection of the colonial slaves to suppress during the war. In India the revolutionary movement has not been at a standstill for one day, and lately we have witnessed the greatest labor strike in Asia, to which the government of Great Britain answered with armored cars.

In this manner the colonial question in its entirety became the order of the day not alone on the green table of the diplomatic conferences in Paris, but also in the colonies themselves. The Wilson program, at the very best, calls only for a change in the firm name of colonial enslavement. Liberation of the colonies can only happen together with liberation of the working class of the capitalist states.

The workers and peasants not only of Annam, Algeria, Bengal, but also of Persia and Armenia, can gain independent existence only after the laborers of England and France have overthrown Lloyd George and Clemenceau and taken the power into their own hands. Even now in the more advanced colonies the battle goes on not only under the flag of national liberation, but it assumes also an open and outspoken social character. Capitalistic Europe has drawn the backward countries by force into the capitalistic whirlpool, and Socialistic Europe will come to the aid of the liberated colonies with its technique, its organ-

ization, its spiritual influence, in order to facilitate their transition into the orderly system of Socialist economy.

Colonial slaves of Africa and Asia! The hour of triumph of the Proletarian Dictatorship of Europe will also be the hour of your release!

II

In those countries in which the historical development has furnished the opportunity, the working class has utilized the regime of political democracy for its organization against capitalism. In all countries where the conditions for a workers' revolution are not yet ripe, the same process will go on. But the great middle layers on the farm lands, as well as in the cities, are hindered by capitalism in their historic development and remain stagnant for whole epochs. The peasant of Bavaria and Baden who does not look behind his church spire, the small French wine-grower who has been ruined by the adulterations practiced by the big capitalists, the small farmer of America plundered and betrayed by bankers and legislators—all these social ranks which have been shoved aside from the main road of development by capitalism, are called on paper by the regime of political democracy to the administration of the state. In reality, however, the finance-oligarchy decides all important questions which determine the destinies of nations behind the back of parliamentary democracy. Particularly was this true of the war question. The same applies to the question of peace.

If the finance-oligarchy considers it advantageous to veil its deeds of violence behind parliamentary votes, then the bourgeois state has at its command in order to gain its ends all the traditions and attainments of former centuries of upper-class rule multiplied by the wonders of capitalistic technique: lies, demagogism, persecution, slander, bribery, calumny and terror. To demand of the proletariat, in the final life and death struggle with capitalism, that it should follow lamblike the demands of bourgeois democracy would be the same as to ask a man who is defending his life against robbers to follow the artificial rules of

a French duel that have been set by his enemy but not followed by him.

SOVIETS THE MEANS OF THE REVOLUTION

In an empire of destruction, where not only the means of production and transportation, but also the institutions of political democracy, represent bloody ruins, the proletariat must create its own forms, to serve above all as a bond of unity for the working class and to enable it to accomplish a revolutionary intervention in the further development of mankind. Such apparatus is represented in the workmen's councils. The old parties, the old unions, have proved incapable in person of their leaders, to understand, much less to carry out, the tasks which the new epoch presents to them. The proletariat created a new institution which embraces the entire working class, without distinction of vocation or political maturity, an elastic form of organization capable of continually renewing itself, expanding, and of drawing into itself ever new elements, ready to open its doors to the working groups of city and village which are near to the proletariat. This indispensable autonomous organization of the working class in the present struggle and in the future conquests of different lands tests the proletariat and represents the greatest inspiration and the mightiest weapon of the proletariat of our time.

THE IMPERIAL STATE COLLAPSES

The collapse of the imperialistic state, czaristic to most democratic, goes on simultaneously with the collapse of the imperialistic military system. The armies of millions, mobilized by imperialism, could remain steadfast only so long as the proletariat remained obedient under the yoke of bourgeoisie. The complete breakdown of national unity signifies also an inevitable disintegration of the army.

Thus it happened, first in Russia, then in Austria-Hungary, then in Germany. The same also is to be expected in other imperialistic states. Insurrection of the peasant against the

landowner, of laborer against capitalist, of both against the monarchic or "democratic" bureaucracy, must lead inevitably to the insurrection of soldier against commander, and, furthermore, to a sharp division between the proletarian and bourgeois elements within the army. The imperialistic war which pitted nation against nation has passed and is passing into the civil war which lines up class against class.

BOURGEOIS HYPOCRISY

The outcry of the bourgeois world against the civil war and the red terror is the most colossal hypocrisy of which the history of political struggles can boast. There would be no civil war if the exploiters who have carried mankind to the very brink of ruin had not prevented every forward step of the laboring masses, if they had not instigated plots and murders and called to their aid armed help from outside to maintain or restore their predatory privileges. Civil war is forced upon the laboring classes by their arch-enemies.

Conscious of the world-historic character of their mission, the enlightened workers strove from the very beginning of the organized Socialist movement for an international union. The foundation stone of this union was laid in 1864 in London, in the first international.

The Franco-Prussian war, from which arose the Germany of the Hohenzollerns, undermined the First International, giving rise at the same time to the national labor parties.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

As early as 1889 these parties united at the Congress of Paris and organized the Second International. But during this period the center of gravity of the labor movement rested entirely on national ground, confining itself within the realm of national parliamentarism to the narrow compass of national states and national industries.

Decades of organizing and labor reformism created a genera-

tion of leaders, most of whom gave verbal recognition to the program of social revolution, but denied it in substance.

They were lost in the swamp of reformism and adaptation to the bourgeois state. The opportunistic character of the leading parties of the Second International was finally revealed—and led to the greatest collapse of the movement in all its history—when events required revolutionary methods of warfare from the labor parties.

Just as the war of 1870 dealt a deathblow to the First International by revealing that there was not in fact behind the social revolutionary program any compact power of the masses, so the war of 1914 killed the Second International by showing that above the consolidated labor masses there stood labor parties which converted themselves into servile organs of the bourgeois state.

Proletarians of all lands! In the war against imperialistic barbarity, against monarchy, against the privileged classes, against the bourgeois state and bourgeois property, against all forms and varieties of social and national oppression—UNITE!

Under the standard of the Workingmen's Councils, in the revolutionary struggle for power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarians of all countries, UNITE!

TO THE WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DECLARATION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AGAINST THE VERSAILLES PEACE

(From the *Communist*, October 4, 1919)

THE governments which began the war of plunder five years ago are making an effort to end it now with a predatory peace. The English, French, and American capitalists represented in Versailles have given to the representatives of the German capitalists the so-called peace terms. Versailles becomes a new Brest-Litovsk. Each one of the points of the Versailles peace is a noose to choke one or another nation.

The anger and vengeance of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the victorious coalition know no bounds. The famous organization of the "League of Nations" is being put into practice by the American-Anglo-French bourgeoisie against the will of all the nations of Europe. The bourgeoisie of the Allied Powers is making an effort to cripple Germany. They are cutting off from Germany a whole series of territories; they are taking away the coal from Germany, and the bread; they wish to take away the merchant marine, also to force Germany to pay indemnities of enormous quantity. The bourgeoisie of the

Allied Powers which in words fought against annexations of alien territory, is now committing a series of terrible and cynical annexations. They are trading with the colonies which belonged to Germany as with cattle. The imperialists of the Allied Powers have armed themselves with knives and are slicing the flesh of Germany.

But the predatory terms of peace which are dictated to Germany from Versailles are only one of the links in the chain of force used by the Allied Powers to imprison the world. At the same moment when these imperialists are trying to cripple and choke Germany, they are carrying on a murderous attack on the Soviet Republic of Hungary. This attack, temporarily, has succeeded.

It is they, the French and English bourgeoisie, who are the main instigators of the Roumanian soldiers at present carrying their White Guard attack against our brethren—the Hungarian workers.

It is they, the representatives of the enlightened French and English “democracy,” who are the instigators of those pogroms let loose upon Red Budapest. It is they who are inspiring the Russian Black Hundreds of Kolchak, Denikine and Krasnov in their bloody war against the Russian workers and peasants.

It is they, the Anglo-French bourgeois, who have inspired the German White Guard, led by Noske, Ebert and Scheidemann, to crush the Bavarian Soviet Republic. The imperialists of the Allied Powers put a direct preliminary condition to the

government of Scheidemann to crush the Soviet Power in Munich.

It is they, the Anglo-French bankers and generals, who are disarming the revolutionary soldiers in Bulgaria. It is they who are choking the mass movement of the peoples and the revolutionary spirit in Serbia and Slovakia.

International gendarmes—such are the Anglo-French and American imperialists, who claim to be the representatives of world “democracy.”

All illusions are broken. The masks are thrown off. Those whom the long and terrible imperialistic war has not taught a lesson, these will have to be taught by that imperialist peace with which the “humanitarians” of Versailles are trying to “enrich” the world. The governments which during the four and one-half years lied to their people about carrying on the war for “self-determination of nations,” for “independence” of small peoples, for “freedom and culture,” for “democracy,”—these governments are now unmasked as arch-criminals, as the worst kind of slave-drivers, showing mercy to none.

The fairy tale of the League of Nations is dying without having had a chance to flourish. After the Versailles peace terms it will be very difficult to catch many workers with the bait of the League of Nations. The League of Nations at whose cradle stands Clemenceau, the butcher, is unmasked before the whole world as a league of murderers, who are nailing to the cross the millions of the laboring masses of Europe.

The Versailles peace, with all its weight, is first of all laid upon the working class of Germany. If the Versailles peace should work at all, it would mean that the working class of Germany would be forced to moan under a double pressure of both its own bourgeois and the slave-drivers of the other nations.

Needless to talk of the fact that the sympathy of the Communist International, the sympathy of the conscious workers of the whole world, is with the German working class. The worker-Communist of all countries will take the Versailles peace terms as a blow to the international proletariat, as an effort which can be only put down by the combined strength of the proletariat of all countries.

The present German government, which in words protests against the Versailles peace, in fact aids the imperialists of the Allied Powers to realize their hellish purposes in relation to the German working class. The executioner Clemenceau has no truer servants in Germany than Scheidemann and Ebert. The Scheidemann and Ebert Party from the first moment of the German revolution humbly danced to the tune of the imperialists of the Allied Powers. Under the direction of Clemenceau, Scheidemann and Ebert sent White Guard armies against Soviet Russia. In order to satisfy the imperialists of the Allied Powers, the Social-Democrats under the leadership of Ebert and Scheidemann killed Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg and with fire and guns crushed the great movement of the German workers to realize Soviet Power. Fulfilling the

directions of the London and Paris exchanges, the government of Scheidemann has killed already not less than 10,000 workers-Communists of Germany. Each time when the wave of the workers' movement in Germany rose especially high, prepared to wash away the government of traitor Social-Democrats, Scheidemann and Ebert threatened the starved workers that if Soviet Power should come to Germany the Allies would refuse to give bread to the German people.

The Central Committee of the Scheidemann Social Democratic Party, in its appeal in connection with the Versailles peace, maintains that the Versailles "lesson" is the "best evidence of the correct position of the German Social Democracy on the question of defending the fatherland."

"Socialists of all lands, do you understand at last our way of acting at the time of war?" asks Scheidemann in his appeal.

Oh, hypocrites! Oh, cynics!

Two robbers in 1914 fell on the same prey. One of the robbers proved the more successful. This criminal not only grabbed the whole prey which his competitor wanted, but went into the pockets of his rival. Then the other thief, made benefactor through want and having on his face the expression of innocence, appeals to the world and exclaims, "You see the conduct of my rival has shown the entire righteousness of my tactics, is it possible that you do not yet understand that we Scheidemanns are whiter than the snow of the English mountains?"

The Versailles peace terms have proven to all conscious workers something altogether different. The enlightened workers of the whole world fully realize that if the German imperialists had been the victors they would have been as unmerciful to the defeated as their rivals are now to them. And then most likely the Hendersons and Renaudels would use the same lying phrases as now Scheidemann and Noske are using.

The Versailles peace terms show us that while Imperialism exists in any country, until then force and robbery will also exist. The Versailles peace terms show the Imperialism of any coalition is equally bloodthirsty. No matter how "democratic" the leaves which they use for covering Imperialism, it remains the incarnation of barbarism and blood lust.

The Versailles peace terms have shown us that social-patriots of all lands have permanently and forever become the servants of the bourgeois. The Versailles peace terms show how meaningless are the hopes of the sympathizers of the Berne yellow "International," of Kautzky and his friends, about the disarmament under Capitalism, about the good and beneficent League of Nations under the wing of Wilson. The Versailles peace terms have shown that the bourgeois itself left for the workers of all lands only one road—the road of world revolution, the road across the corpse of Capitalism.

Workers of France! Workers of England! Workers of America! Workers of Italy! The Communist International appeals to you. Upon you depends the

destiny of tens of millions of workers of Austria and Germany. You must say your word now. You must pull out of the bloody hands of your government that murderous knife which they have put over the heads of the German and Austrian workers. You must show that for you the lessons of the five-year war have not been in vain. You must not forget for a moment that the victory of the allied imperialists over the German and Austrian workers means a victory over you, a victory over the workers of the whole world, a victory over Socialism. You more than any now have in your hands the destiny of international Socialism. To you the enlightened workers of the world look. And we are sure that you will fulfill your duty, against the advice of your own Scheidemanns.

Workers of Germany! Workers of Austria! Now you see that you have no choice other than the immediate overthrow of the government of traitors calling themselves Social-Democrats, and in fact acting as the meanest agents of the bourgeoisie. You see now where polities of the Noske-Scheidemann type brought you. You see that your only hope lies in the international proletarian revolution.

But this revolution of the proletariat the Scheidemanns and Eborts are trying in every way to crush. When the Scheidemanns and Eborts call in your name to the international proletariat they will meet no answer other than hatred.

Those people who do not protest by a word against the crushing of Soviet Hungary by the armies of the

landowners, those people who near Libau are fighting on the side of the German barons—those people cannot count on support from the international proletariat. In your name should speak, not Count Brockdorff von Ranzau, not the traitor Landsberg, not the executioners, Noske and Scheidemann. While the present German government is in power the quarrel between Berlin and Paris will be only between the bourgeoisie of two coalitions. All the power in your country must soon go into the hands of the workers' Soviets. In your name, workers, Communists must begin to talk.

Then and only then will you be able to save your country, will you be able to count upon full support from the proletariat of all lands.

The time for indecision has passed. Now it is clear to each one of us that it cannot be worse, that the government of social-traitors has brought you to the edge of the precipice.

Workers of Germany and Austria! Know that proletarians of other countries will never believe in the German Social-Democracy, that Social-Democracy which did not utter one word of protest at the moment when the government of Wilhelm Hohenzollern forced upon Soviet Russia the Brest-Litovsk peace.

Workers of Germany and Austria! Know that if the Brest-Litovsk peace forced upon Russia in 1918 collapsed so soon, it is because the Russian workers and peasants overthrew the government of the bourgeoisie and social traitors and took the power

into their own hands. Only due to this were they able comparatively quickly to break the Brest-Litovsk noose.

World proletarian revolution—this is the only savior for the oppressed workers of the world!

Dictatorship of the proletariat and the organizations of Soviet Power—this is the only escape for the proletariat of the whole world from the Versailles methods.

While Capitalism exists there can be no real peace. Permanent peace will be possible only on the ruins of the bourgeois state.

Long live the uprising of the workers against oppression! Down with the Versailles peace, down with the new Brest-Litovsk! Down with the government of social-traitors!

Long live Soviet Power throughout the entire world!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International, G. Zinoviev, Chairman.

U. S. SOCIALIST REQUEST TO JOIN TAKEN UP IN MOSCOW

(From N. Y. *Call*, November 30, 1920)

APPARENT REPLY PRINTED IN RUSSIAN PAPER CON-
DEMNS PARTY STAND AND PROGRAM HERE—REA-
SONS FOR ORIGINAL SUPPORT OF THIRD IN-
TERNATIONAL ARE ATTACKED

THE document printed below is taken from a Communist organ entitled *The Russian Press Review*, October, 1920, No. 5. It is printed in English either in Russia or on the border, and is intended for circulation in English-speaking countries. It is the first evidence we have that the application of the Socialist Party for affiliation reached Russia and that it was considered.

Whether this is intended as an official reply we do not know. The first paragraph would indicate that it was drawn up by the executive officials of the Third International. After stating that the "Executive Committee" had received the application of affiliation, "accompanied by the resolution adopted by referendum," the second paragraph begins with the words, "We are in possession also of the report of the National Convention of the Socialist Party

held in New York in May, 1920." The word "we" used in connection with the words "Executive Committee" certainly indicates it is the Executive Committee speaking through this document. Our comment on the document may be found in the editorial columns.

The document follows:

DEAR COMRADES:

The official notification from the Socialist Party of the United States of affiliation to the Communist International, accompanied by the resolution adopted by referendum, has been brought before the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

We are in possession also of the report of the National Convention of the Socialist Party held in New York in May, 1920, containing the resolution upon International relations, adopted by the convention in place of that previously adopted by referendum—which latter was again presented as a minority resolution by Victor Berger.

Since the resolutions will be submitted to referendum once more, it is necessary to examine all three. All that can be said of Berger's resolution is, first, that it is honestly reactionary; and, second, that we are surprised that it could be offered in a convention of a party which calls itself Socialist.

Concerning the minority resolution—which, except for the addition of George Lansbury's opinion of what Lenin thought about conditions of affiliation to the Communist International, is the same as the resolution adopted by referendum—there is more to say.

It begins with a long preamble condemning the Second International—a formula which has become so common, even to the parties of the Right, that it has ceased to have any meaning. The section dealing with the Communist International reads as follows [Italics ours]:

"The Socialist Party of the United States, therefore, declares itself in support of the Third (Moscow) International, *not so much because it supports the 'Moscow' programs and methods, but because:*

"(a) Moscow is *doing something* which is really challenging to world imperialism.

"(b) Moscow is threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world simply because it is proletarian.

"(c) Under these circumstances, *whatever we may have to say to Moscow afterward*, it is the duty of Socialists to stand by it *now*, because its fall will mean the fall of Socialist republic in Europe, and also the disappearance of Socialist hopes for years to come."

The reasons stated for affiliation to the Communist International have nothing to do with Communism, and indeed imply very serious reservations concerning what the author calls "Moscow" programs and methods—by which we take it Communism is meant.

NO REASON SEEN FOR APPLYING TO COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

It is, of course, very gratifying to have the sympathy of the American Socialist Party because the Communist International is "threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world." This is, however, hardly a valid reason for a party's wishing to join the Communist International, or for the Communist International to accept such a party. But there is no other reason given, except that the Communist International is "doing something" which is "challenging to world imperialism" just what, the author evidently prefers to conceal from the American proletariat.

This resolution evidently is based on a misconception of the role of the Communist International. The Communist International is in no sense a defensive organization. It is an organ of aggression, the General Staff of the World Revolution, for the forcible overthrow of the capitalist state everywhere, and the setting up of the dictatorship of the Proletariat. Concerning

questions of principle and fundamental aims, it is impossible to consider what the American Socialist Party "may have to say to Moscow afterwards."

On the contrary, the Communist International has something to say to parties desiring to affiliate, before they are accepted.

The Communist International is not "Moscow," but a centralized and disciplined organization now comprising the great majority of the revolutionary working class parties of the world. The Second Congress, just ended, contained representatives of the revolutionary vanguard of the workers of all countries. There were also present delegates of the French Socialist Party and the German Independent Social Democratic party, which only a few months ago were engaged in trying to form the "Two-and-a-half" International, by means of a conference at which the centrist parties would dominate, which would establish a basis for resistance to Communism, a center of sabotage of the World Revolution. It is this idea which animates the Hillquit, or majority, resolution adopted by the Socialist Party convention, with the exception that neither the Germans nor the French party have ever dared to declare themselves against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, as has been done by the Socialist Party of the United States.

APPLICATION RESULT OF PRESSURE

This scheme has failed, because the working class of the world is in favor of placing itself under the leadership of the Communist International and the leaders of the centrist parties, pushed onward by pressure of the masses, now come to us desiring admission to the Communist International. This is even more true of the Hillquits and Lees of the American party, who, even while they declare themselves opposed to the principles of the Communist International, yet do not dare to withdraw from it.

And to all these parties the Communist International replies:

The Communist International is not a hotel, where travellers may come with their own baggage and carry on their private

affairs. The Communist International is an army in wartime; volunteers who join the army of revolution must adopt its principles and obey its orders, submit to its discipline. None but revolutionary Communist parties are accepted in the Communist International. They must adopt as their program the program of the Communist International—open revolutionary mass-struggle for Communism, through the dictatorship of the proletariat, by means of workers' Soviets—accepting as binding all resolutions of the congresses and executive committee of the Communist International. They must create a strongly centralized form of organization, a military discipline; all party members in public office, in the labor unions, in all forms of public activity, must be absolutely subject to the full-powered central committee of the party, which is the supreme organ directing all the phases of party work.

They must consistently denounce bourgeois democracy and social patriotism, and also the falsehood and hypocrisy of social pacifism; they must systematically demonstrate to the workers that without a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist state no talk of disarmament, no international arbitration, no League of Nations can save mankind from new imperialist wars.

EXPULSION OF "CENTRISTS" URGED

They must immediately break with reformism and the policy of the centrists; they must expel from their ranks all non-revolutionary elements, all opportunist leaders; they must sever all connections with the petty bourgeoisie, and prepare for revolutionary action, for merciless civil war.

The report of the May convention of the Socialist Party proves very clearly that this party is very far indeed from specification above outlined.

The declaration of principles adopted is an affront to the working class. It alone, if indorsed by the membership, is sufficient to separate the Socialist Party of the United States from the revolutionary movement.

The rejection of the resolution indorsing the dictatorship of

the proletariat is of course inadmissible in any party seeking to join the Communist International. And we do not know a single Socialist Party in the world which has equalled the action of the American party in abolishing from its constitution two years after the World War the provision forbidding legislative representatives to vote for military appropriations.

AMERICAN SOCIALISTS DESERT REVOLUTION

Up to the present the American Socialist Party has been considered a centrist party, but it definitely abandons all Socialist pretensions, it definitely enters the ranks of the bourgeois reform parties, with the adoption of the following declaration:

“Its (the Socialist Party’s) ultimate aim in politics is to secure a majority in Congress and in every state legislature, to win the principal executive and judicial offices, to become the dominant and controlling political party of the country, in order to accomplish Socialism.”

If this childish and antiquated conception of the task of a Socialist Party, which even the yellow Second International—from which the American Socialist Party has indignantly withdrawn—did not dare openly to proclaim, is the actual honest attitude of the membership of the Socialist Party of the United States, after all that has happened, after the World War, the Russian Revolution, and in particular after the year of black reaction in the United States, the persecution of revolutionists, the expulsion of the Socialists at Albany—then we do not understand why the American Socialist Party wishes to enter the Communist International, why it does not indorse the League of Nations, as Meyer London advocates.

DEMOCRACY ADVOCATES ARE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONISTS

The centrist parties, the German Independents and the French Socialists are not yet acceptable for entrance into the Communist International. Yet they accept the program of mass action and dictatorship of the proletariat, based on the Soviets. Any party which still advocates political democracy is a thou-

sand times worse than these parties; it is a counter-revolutionary, a Scheidemann party.

The convention was dominated by centrist and reactionary elements—by the yellow “reformist-politicians,” Hillquit, Lee, Stedman, O’Neal, Block, Panken; by the “one-hundred-percent Americans,” Meyer London, Solomon; by the “state Socialists” and inverted social patriot, Victor Berger; by Cannon and Saltis [Soltis], Karlin and Berlin [Berlyn]—all of whom have no place in a party affiliated to the Communist International. There was a “Left Wing”—England [Engdahl], Kruse, Tucker, Holland, etc.—which demanded affiliation to the Communist International, and a revolutionary restatement of party principles; but this group was a pitiful minority, its ideas were confused, permeated by cowardly compromise and petty bourgeois prejudices. In all the convention not one Communist voice was heard.

But perhaps the most significant action of the reactionary machine was to stifle debate and refuse to answer questions concerning the defense of the Socialist assemblymen expelled at Albany.

POSITION AT ALBANY “TRIAL” DENOUNCED

For example, the testimony of Assemblyman Louis Waldman—still a member of the Socialist Party—shows that he declared himself opposed to the establishment of a Soviet Government in the United States, that he preferred the government of the state of New York—which is a “people’s government” and “not a capitalist government”—to the Soviet Government; that he urges all workers to take part in a war of defense; that he would vote for military appropriations, etc.

This, however, is only the statement of an individual member. Take the official defense of the party, the “Brief for the Socialist Assemblymen.” It apologizes for the presence of foreigners in the party by calling them “potential voters,” and hastens to explain that a new rule requires all party members immediately to become citizens. It rejects the general strike as a political weapon, on the ground that if there are enough workers to strike

for a political reform, there are enough to win it by voting. "The Soviet form of government," it says, "seems to be good for Russia. The parliamentary form of government seems to be good for the United States...." But the most base betrayal of Socialism occurs in the passage explaining why the Socialist Party supports the Soviet Government:

"We sympathize with the Russian workers, the Russian peasants, the Russian Socialists, the Russian Communists, in maintaining their Soviet Government—not because it is a Soviet government, but because it is a government of their own choosing. Suppose they had adopted a different form of government, say one that had sprung from the Constituent Assembly, we should not support it any the less."

Is this, perhaps, what the American Socialist "will have to say to Moscow afterward"? Noske and Mannerheim, Lloyd George and Wilson could indorse this treacherous logic with a clear conscience.

The "Socialist" alderman of New York, who voted for the Liberty Loan, who voted for money to erect the Victory Arch; the "Socialist" congressman, Meyer London, who congratulated the King of Italy upon his birthday, who voted for the war credits; the "Socialist" legislators at Albany, who declared publicly against Communism; the "Socialist" district attorney of Milwaukee, who imprisoned workingmen for breaking up a religious meeting; the "Socialist" officials who called in the Chicago police to expel the Communists from the 1919 Convention—all these "comrades" are still members of the Socialist Party of the United States: in fact, they controlled the May Convention.

It will be pointed out that the selection of Eugene Debs as presidential candidate proves that the American Socialist Party is a revolutionary party.

DECEPTION PRACTICED BY REVOLUTIONARY PHRASES

It is a characteristic tactic of centrist parties to make use of revolutionary phrases, of revolutionary personalities, to deceive

the working masses, to persuade them to follow opportunist leaders.

Comrade Debs has a fine revolutionary record. All the more shame to "Socialist" leaders of the American party, who have exploited the imprisonment of Debs for their own selfish, non-revolutionary purposes, and who, in nominating him for President, once more attempt to cover up and justify their compromising and cowardly attitude—at the same time refusing to consider Comrade Debs' proposal for unity with the Communists.

Nowhere in the world is the persecution of Communists, of true Socialists, more bitter on the part of the capitalist class. Thousands of our Comrades have been deported, imprisoned for long terms, tortured and beaten, in the United States. In America alone, out of all the non-revolutionary countries, the Communist movement is illegal, must function underground—those who are Communists remain so at the risk of their liberty, their lives.

The Socialist Party of the United States submits to this terrorism; it endeavors to prove itself harmless to the capitalist dictatorship, non-revolutionary—and succeeds rather well. Swallowing the ejection of its representatives from Congress, from the State Legislatures, it praises the government, indorses ever more warmly the bourgeois state system, helping in this way to escape the consequences of defending the working class against the capitalist system. And the convention rejects a resolution of sympathy for Larkin and Gitlow, Communist fighters, taken prisoners in the class war.

If the majority of the American Socialist Party indorses the decisions of this convention, then we have but one thing to say to those honest workers who still may remain within the party:

You are being deceived. The Socialist Party of the United States is not a working-class party, but an auxiliary organization of the American bourgeoisie, or world imperialism. It is not leading you toward Socialism—it is betraying you to the counter-revolution.

Workers! Leave the American Socialist Party. It is your enemy and ours. Already in America there is a revolutionary

party, the United Communist party, the American section of the Communist International. These are our true comrades. Thousands of them have suffered for the revolution. This is the party of the revolutionary working class.

Join the United Communist party!

And to the leaders, the officials of the Socialist Party of the United States—the Bergers, Hillquits, Londons, Lees—we have only this to say:

You have disgraced the name of “Socialists.” You apply for admission to the Communist International; we answer by declaring war upon you traitors to the working class, who, on the eve of the world revolution, sold out to the enemy to save your skins.

THE END

Date Due

OCT 11 1973 CO RC 81
6-16

AUG 7 1982

UML 735

Richter HX86.W65 1921
The social interpretation of history



3 5051 00598 9480

